

March 8, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1029

conservation commissions in the field of soil and water conservation. The principal source of the technical assistance to districts is from the Soil Conservation Service.

For over 25 years this service has been provided free to all landowners. The present budget submitted for the U.S. Department of Agriculture includes the following proposal:

"A reduction of \$20 million is anticipated for 1966 under legislation being proposed to authorize the establishment of a public enterprise revolving fund to finance in part the cost of technical services provided to soil conservation districts and cooperating farmers, ranchers, and other landowners in the design, layout, and installation of planned soil and water conservation practices. The proposed legislation would require that cooperating soil conservation districts or landowners and operators pay to the service up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance furnished to help install planned practices on their lands. Receipts derived from this source and deposited in the fund would be available in their entirety for installation services." (From "Appendix to the Budget for Fiscal Year 1966.")

The district supervisors are unanimously opposed to making charges for these services. They feel it would materially reduce the amount of conservation practices being applied on the land. By making charges for these services, the bulk of the conservation work would be done on the land of a few who could afford to pay for such services. The small landowner who is in greatest need of technical assistance could not afford to pay for the technical help. It would be difficult for this group of landowners to raise sufficient funds to pay for the installation of conservation practices.

The present workload in each district is greater than what can be serviced with the limited personnel now available.

The rapid change from farmland to other land uses has created a need for technical guidance to additional individuals and planning groups.

Advance planning is needed to adequately protect the land and avoid costly mistakes through improper water management.

One of the fine programs which was enacted by the Congress during the Roosevelt era was the establishment of this U.S. Soil Conservation Service. The technical excellence of their staff and the contribution that these staff members are now making to their various communities is irreplaceable.

President Johnson has placed a very high priority on the preservation of our country's natural resources and technical guidance that will be needed by our communities throughout the country can only be supplied by these Soil Conservation technicians. It would seem penny wise and pound foolish with the programs now starting and sponsored by the Federal Government in grant programs for natural resources to our States, to deprive them of this professional knowledge that is presently available.

Your testimony before the appropriations committee in previous years, has been excellent and much appreciated by the people in Connecticut. After reviewing the current budget proposal, if you agree with the need for continuing free technical services to promote soil and water conservation, we would appreciate your support before appropriate congressional committees to make known the needs for conservation in Connecticut.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH N. GILL,  
Commissioner.

NORTH STONINGTON  
CONSERVATION COMMISSION,  
North Stonington, Conn., February 8, 1965.  
Hon. WILLIAM ST. ONGE,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ST. ONGE: This commission has learned that the President's

budget includes a recommendation to cut the appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service by \$10 million. We feel that this cut would virtually eradicate this agency, which was established by F.D.R., has operated with signal success and always on a meager budget.

In order to raise the necessary funds, the agency would have to charge fees for some of its services which it has been providing free for the past 30-odd years. The SCS has benefited small landowners and the general public, whose interests are always served by good land and water conservation practices.

The SCS has been performing in a new and vital area by cooperating with commissions like ours in supplying technical assistance which small towns could not afford to pay for and could not obtain elsewhere. Our commission works closely with our zoning board, which relies on SCS soil capability determinations to back up its decisions. The SCS provides us with detailed information on drainage conditions which play a vital role in proper zoning. The health officer relies on their findings also. Their maps have been used in conjunction with our open space recommendations for inclusion in our forthcoming town plan. SCS representatives have given unstintingly of their time and resources, sending representatives to evening and Sunday meetings. We could not function without them.

The President's conservation program would be a farce if it should allow crippling of this vital agency. Will you please use your good offices to keep the SCS functioning at top efficiency and try to increase, rather than cut, its modest budget.

Sincerely yours,

ADELE ERISMAN,  
Secretary.

## Urgent Second Look at Great Society

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Wednesday, March 3, 1965, issue of the Los Angeles Times.

The Times very appropriately points to the need for close inspection of proposed Government programs to avoid costly error. It underscores the call by Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, chairman of the House Republican conference, for a second look at Great Society proposals.

The editorial is as follows:

## URGENT SECOND LOOK AT GREAT SOCIETY

Only an idiot steps deliberately in front of a steamroller, or sticks his finger into a buzzsaw, or tries singlehandedly to hold back a raging flood.

But this does not mean that it is idiotic to sound a warning when the steamroller rolls, or the buzzsaw buzzes, or the flood floods.

Thus we salute today the commendable realism, and practical approach, which is apparently being developed by the badly outnumbered GOP leadership in Congress.

As chairman of the policy-conscious House Republican conference, Representative MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin, acknowledges the futility of trying to stem the expectable flow of Great Society legislation this year. After all, the lineup is 295 to 140 in favor of the Johnson administration.

Says LAIRD: "Though we do not win rollcall votes, we can win for America the all-important second look that may save us from blindly accepting a Great Society that might be just another great mistake, just another great scheme, just another great debt accepted without due consideration."

Now, this is not to say that all of President Johnson's vast blueprint is bad. Certainly a part of it, handled with prudence, may lead toward a better Nation. There are other disturbing aspects of the Great Society program, however, that contain proliferating seeds of costly growth, whose future no man can reckon with any accuracy.

These are the projects that need a "second look," and toward which responsible Republicans must address themselves either with compelling arguments or sensible alternatives.

## Act I, the Funny Money Era

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial which appeared in the Phoenix, Ariz., Gazette of March 3, and which points up the dangers of—and the responsibility for—our current silver coinage problem. Since an inherently valuable coinage is historically necessary to the stability of America's economic system, it behooves all of us to think seriously and act wisely in an effort to alleviate the situation with which we are presently faced.

The editorial follows:

## ACT I, THE FUNNY MONEY ERA

It requires something less than an advanced degree in economics to whet one's suspicions that something is seriously amiss when normally sedate banks in some American cities must exchange \$1 in paper money and \$1 in trading stamps for each \$1 in silver turned in to them.

The sad fact of life is that we are rapidly running out of silver; that the time is imminent when the cost of using silver for coins will be prohibitive, anyway, and that we must either abandon silver as a coinage base entirely, or sharply reduce the silver content. At what cost to public confidence can only be guessed.

Both natural and unnatural causes are cited for this current kettle of fish that we are in—and they range all the way from the increase in the industrial use of silver and the growth of the vending machine business to the spreading popularity of coin collecting. The real nub, however, is to be found in the Federal Government's long-time preoccupation with playing fast and loose with our currency for political purposes, and with its more recent refusal to realize that Gresham's law—"bad money drives out good"—is still as valid now as it was in the 16th century.

To stimulate free world silver production, and to conserve our coinage, the late President Kennedy freed silver from its 90-cent-an-ounce pegged price and instituted a program of retiring our silver certificates—redeemable 100 percent in silver—and replacing them with Federal reserve notes, backed 25 percent by gold, but not redeemable. The move, unfortunately, flew directly in the face of Gresham's law. Immediately, the bad money, the Federal Reserve notes, drove out the good money, silver dollars. From a stockpile of more than 95 million cartwheels in December 1962 (which the Treasury billed

A1030

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 8, 1965

as a 25-year supply) the supply fell to 3 million in just 15 months and is now virtually nonexistent.

Even if the silver were available, which it is not, continued coinage is impossible since silver, now trading on the free market, has risen in price to \$1.29 an ounce and has reached the point where it has become profitable to melt silver dollars down for their silver content. Once the price rises to \$1.38 an ounce, which is inevitable, it will then be profitable to melt down lesser silver coins—quarters and dimes. The British went through this politically explosive upheaval in the 1920's, to their everlasting regret.

The upheaval we face in our currency is going to be chaotic, and the current Democratic administration has no choice but to accept responsibility for being the one that politticked silver coins out of existence . . . for being the administration that debased our currency and launched us on a funny money kick with ominous potentialities.

### The Sino-Soviet Conflict—Part III

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert into the Record a second article by Dr. Donald A. Zagoria, a member of Columbia University's Research Institute on Communist Affairs and the author of the authoritative "The Sino-Soviet Conflict, 1956-61."

In this article, which appeared in the January 31, 1965, Washington Post editorial section, Dr. Zagoria assesses some of the probabilities and myths which surround the question of American withdrawal from southeast Asia and its effect on Russia and China.

The article follows:

(By Donald S. Zagoria)

What would be the effect of an American withdrawal from Vietnam? Is the domino theory valid? Would withdrawal set in motion a chain of forces that would ultimately spell the end of our position as a Pacific power and a retreat "back to Waikiki"? What would be the likely consequences elsewhere in Asia of an American defeat in Vietnam? What effect would it have on Russia and China?

None of these questions can be answered with certainty because they involve too many imponderables. But it may be worthwhile to try to assess some of the probabilities and to dispel some of the myths.

Defeat for the United States in Vietnam—no matter how it was disguised—would almost certainly encourage the Chinese and other Communist parties in underdeveloped areas to believe that the Chinese model of "liberation war" is neither so risky nor so pointless as the Russians have contended. Chinese prestige in the international Communist movement, particularly among those parties in the neutral camps, would be enhanced and the "paper tiger" thesis would probably be more widely accepted.

#### SEEK FERTILE SOIL

This does not mean that the Chinese or other Asian Communists would run amok. The Chinese would not necessarily encourage other Communist parties to emulate Ho Chi Minh of North Vietnam unless conditions were deemed proper and unless there was a

pro-Western government in power that Peiping wanted removed.

The Chinese are revolutionaries but they are aware that a successful revolution or "liberation war" must be carefully prepared and that it must take place in fertile soil. The ground for the Vietcong success today in South Vietnam was carefully prepared many years ago. Nor are the Chinese interested in indiscriminately promoting revolution. In countries such as Burma and Cambodia, which have moved away from the United States, Peiping shows little interest in sponsoring subversion.

China's major goal is to remove American influence from Asia. The promotion of "liberation wars" is only one of several ways to achieve that goal. What we can expect from China in the event of the loss of South Vietnam, then, is increased pressure on other pro-Western countries in Asia, such as Thailand and Malaysia.

Another important question concerns the relationship between China and other Asian Communist parties such as the Vietnamese. This relationship is often oversimplified in either of two ways. The first says that the North Vietnamese and all other Asian Communists are stooges or satellites of China. This is not the case. The North Vietnamese made their own revolution and have their own interests, some of which overlap with those of China and some of which conflict. For years Hanoi sought to steer a middle course between Moscow and Peiping. It finally landed in the Peiping camp not because of any blind loyalty to China but because it decided that alliance with Peiping would best promote the goal of unifying Vietnam under Hanoi's hegemony. Hanoi is now a firm ally of Peiping because it has little other choice, given its goal and U.S. opposition to it. If it should achieve its goal, however, a Titoist development would be quite likely in North Vietnam.

The other oversimplification—at the opposite extreme—maintains that North Vietnam is now or can be thoroughly independent of Peiping. For the foreseeable future, Peiping and Hanoi have certain overlapping interests, the most important of which is to eliminate American power and influence from southeast Asia. To achieve that goal, Hanoi needs Peiping's backing.

#### RUSSIAN MORAL SUPPORT

In the longer run, Chinese military power and the logic of geography will keep Hanoi in Peiping's sphere of influence, much as Rumania remains in the Soviet sphere despite her recent show of independence.

As to the Russians, an American defeat in Vietnam would not likely bring about any fundamental change in their interest in a detente. The Russians would continue to hesitate to risk any direct confrontation with the United States by sponsoring "liberation wars." But they would be more hard-pressed to refute the Peiping argument that the United States is a paper tiger and thus might give increased moral support to such wars.

The most difficult question in many respects is: What effect would American withdrawal from Vietnam have on other countries in south and southeast Asia that lie within the shadow of China?

The view of Peiping from Bangkok is different from the view from New Delhi, and even within one country there are great differences of opinion. Nevertheless, in a trip I made a year and a half ago through most of Asia, I gained the clear impression that Chinese power—even before Peiping's explosion of a nuclear device—was beginning to make itself felt as never before. I found what can only be called a preoccupation with, and growing respect for, China.

In Indonesia, both army leaders and members of the political elite seemed to feel that the mainland of southeast Asia will eventually be lost to China. General Nasution,

chief of the armed forces, told me that there was no way to prevent this unless the smaller countries in the area acquired a sense of "national identity" such as Indonesia has. A high-ranking official in the Foreign Office said Indonesia would have good relations with China for the next 10 years but after that, when China had gained the mainland of southeast Asia, there would be a showdown at the water's edge.

In one small Asian country, a government official suggested only half jokingly that Russia and the United States ought to carve up China now before it is too late.

In Pakistan, a high-ranking official suggested that we ought to accept a neutralization of Indochina inasmuch as the French experience demonstrated that it is not possible to win a military victory. He made the further point that the Chinese and North Vietnamese might now be willing to negotiate a political settlement in return for certain quid pro quos, whereas in a few years they may well be strong enough to take what they want without negotiating.

These were opposing positions but they have a common denominator and one, I believe, that is widely shared in the area: the view that Chinese power is increasing and will have to be reckoned with by one means or another.

In regard to Cambodia, there is a popular aphorism: When China catches cold, Cambodia sneezes. Prince Sihanouk, the Cambodian leader, has been saying for some time that China represents the wave of the future in southeast Asia—a situation he ascribes largely to the failure of American policy—and he has been acting accordingly. Although there is a school of American opinion that attributes paranoid tendencies to all Asian leaders whom we find difficult to understand, there is no reason to believe that Sihanouk is acting out of anything but a realistic assessment of the balance of forces.

There was a paradox in all this, it seemed to me at the time. Communist China had recently encountered serious economic difficulties at home, and had separated itself from the Soviet Union. One might have thought that such developments would undermine China's prestige in the world at large. A common reaction in Asia to Peiping's domestic problems, however, when they were known about at all, was that they were merely temporary setbacks.

Chinese discipline and determination—these were the essential things that stood out in the minds of the majority of the people with whom I talked.

China's successful show of force against India certainly did nothing to detract from this image. Indeed, most Asians seemed to lack sympathy for India, and several officials were quick to say that India got just what she deserved.

The smaller countries around the perimeter of China stand in awe of her for many reasons. Sheer size and proximity are of course factors of great importance. If China rolls in her sleep, one official told me, his country might be crushed just by accident.

There are also important historical and cultural factors. Much of the area around China has at one time or another been under direct or indirect domination by the Chinese Empire. Some of the smaller countries paid tribute to Peiping. Chinese civilization spread to—or strongly influenced—Korea, Japan, the Ryukyus, and much of southeast Asia. In short, China—long before it was Communist—was accustomed to a dominant role in east Asia and many of the smaller countries in east and southeast Asia recognized her dominance.

There is another way in which Asian respect for Chinese power is nurtured: through the overseas Chinese, who economically dominate many of the southeast Asian countries. Particularly in countries that recognize Peiping, the Communist Embassy exerts a strong



March 8, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1031

influence on the local Chinese community. Those Chinese businessmen who do not cooperate with Peiping will often find more cooperative Chinese opening up businesses right across the street from them.

Even in such countries as Thailand, where there is a Nationalist embassy, many in the large Chinese community take considerable pride in the fact that there is a strong central government in China once again and that Peiping has been strong enough to defy the world's two great powers, Russia and the United States. It is this basic emotional bond—similar to that which ties most Jews throughout the world to Israel—that convinces many southeast Asian governments that the Chinese in their midst are a potential fifth column whether they are pro-Communist or pro-Nationalist.

Moreover, the 17 million Chinese overseas are the most industrious and talented people in southeast Asia. This is one of the reasons that there is a reluctance to assimilate them. One Indonesian official told me the Chinese in Indonesia, outnumbered 6 to 1, worked three times as hard as the Indonesians. Similarly, I asked the Cambodian Minister of Agriculture why the Cambodians did not try to assimilate the Chinese community. He said they couldn't afford to because the Cambodians would wake up one morning and find the whole National Assembly in the hands of the Chinese.

There is yet another factor reinforcing the respect for Chinese power. Some Asian countries have strong pro-Peiping Communist Parties. Their leaders hope to keep these parties at bay by being friendly to China. One of several reasons for the growing friendship of Indonesian President Sukarno with China is that he wants to keep his own pro-Peiping party in line.

In Burma, Premier Ne Win also faces a strong Communist Party that, unlike the Indonesian party, is engaged in armed struggle against the Government. But Ne Win nevertheless pursues a friendly policy toward China. His calculation may be that if he moved closer to the West, the Chinese would give substantial assistance to the Burmese Communists, something they have refrained from doing for the past decade.

In Cambodia, it is not an internal Communist Party which Sihanouk wishes to keep under control, but an external one, namely the North Vietnamese. The North Vietnamese represent to Cambodia both a hostile Communist state and, probably more importantly, a traditional enemy. To restrain the North Vietnamese and to guarantee his country's security, Sihanouk believes that he can rely upon China. Sihanouk probably believes that by moving closer to China and away from the West, he gives the Chinese little incentive to sponsor communism within Cambodia. And he is correct. Peiping does not seek to subvert him. Might not the Thais one day come to believe that a rapprochement with China would benefit them in the same manner by ending Chinese-supported attempts to subvert the pro-Western government.

Meanwhile in Cambodia and elsewhere, I found a lack of confidence in the United States. A senior American military officer in Phnom Penh told me—before the withdrawal of the American military mission—that several American officers had directly asked their Cambodian counterparts whether they felt that they could count on American support if the chips were down. The Cambodian officers replied that they had confidence in individual American officers but none in the American Government. The fact that the American aid program was only on a year-to-year basis was often cited as evidence of the ambiguity of U.S. support.

Communist China's explosion of a nuclear device has almost certainly increased the

growing respect for China throughout Asia. Of the only two Asian powers that could possibly stand as a counterweight to China, India has been humbled and Japan seems ambivalent. There are powerful political forces in Japan whose pressures will set severe limits on Japan's ability to help the United States contain Chinese power.

Against this background, it seems reasonable to conclude that an American withdrawal from Vietnam would strengthen the view that is already widely held in much of Asia: That Chinese power is growing and there is little to stop it.

Sihanouk, who clearly distinguishes between Hanoi and Peiping—he has based his policy on an attempt to play one against the other—has nevertheless long recognized that whatever influence Peiping has over Hanoi, any extension of Communist power in Asia would change the balance of forces against the United States. This is a basic fact of life and Sihanouk has acted upon it. The more the Communists have been successful in South Vietnam, the more he has moved away from the United States and closer to China. A similar reaction will almost certainly take place elsewhere in Asia if the United States withdraws. And to this extent the domino theory works.

The problem of how to contain communism in Vietnam emerges inescapably as part of the much larger problem of how to contain Chinese power in Asia. While still in the minor leagues as a global power, China is now close to being the dominant regional power in Asia. We must either reconcile ourselves to this development or be prepared for a long and costly effort. There is no easier way.

### Spangled Banner Deemed Worthy of Awe, Respect

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 2, 1965*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the Yazoo City, Miss., high school paper, the Yazooan, has again received an award from the Freedom Foundation.

The editorial entitled "Spangled Banner Deemed Worthy of Awe, Respect," and which appeared in the October 31, 1963, issue won the George Washington Honor Medal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this prize-winning editorial which was written by Miss Elizabeth Cooper, now a student at Baylor University.

The editorial follows:

Henry Bennett describes the patriotic feeling exhibited toward the American flag in "The Flag Goes By" when he pens "Hats Off: The Flag Is Passing By."

Every nation claims a national flag as its chief symbol, an image for the country's land, its people, its government, and its ideals. Men and women have died to protect their national flag from dishonor and disgrace.

To honor and respect this national emblem should not only be a responsibility, but a privilege and honor; for the American flag represents a heritage of toil, sweat, and tears for freedom.

Recognizing the civic duty high school students owe to their country, the student body pledges daily to "one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

### U.S. Information Service Carries Our Message to the World

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. DONALD M. FRASER**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 8, 1965*

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the dedicated work of the U.S. Information Service has been evaluated carefully by the oversea staff of the Christian Science Monitor.

USIS is today frequently a target of political groups which abhor freedom. Nevertheless, the superb work of this cultural arm of the American Government has great impact on the search for democratic ways of solving problems.

I therefore commend to my colleagues the following report which appeared in the March 4, 1965, issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

THEY CARRY U.S. IMAGE TO THE WORLD, BUT—

The U.S. Information Service—USIS—speaks to the world for America and its policies. It attempts to project a rounded view of the United States. A survey by the Christian Science Monitor finds that USIS is more effective than is generally known. But the problems of USIS posts are many. Libraries are sometimes targets for angry protests against America foreign policy. USIS programs do not always fit the needs of local conditions. Monitor correspondents here discuss the impact of USIS in various parts of the world.

FAR EAST

HONG KONG.—The triumphs and failures of the U.S. Information Service in the Far East are perhaps best illustrated by two vignettes.

The setting for both is Djakarta, capital of Indonesia.

Scene of the first is a pleasant street where stands the American library operated by USIS. Suddenly a marching mob, thought to be heading for the American Embassy in another part of the city, swerves and changes course.

It rushes the library, smashes its way in, wrecks the reading room, tears down the American flag, and burns it.

The second vignette takes place a few days later.

The scene this time is the home of an American Foreign Service officer in Djakarta. Being shown there is the USIS film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," the film depicting President Kennedy's achievements and funeral procession. The film must be shown in a private house because American films of all kinds are barred from public viewing in Indonesia.

After 90 minutes of this moving record the lights are turned on and show Indonesian women in the audience sobbing, the Indonesian men grim and taut.

Perhaps the audience may not be pro-American. But for a few minutes at least this film has built a bridge of humanity between two peoples.

What propaganda specialist could ask for more?

Such anomalies—the sacking of a USIS library yet the brilliant success of a USIS film—in the same city just a few days apart, indicate the range of reaction to USIS in Asia.

Some old Far Eastern hands blast USIS for lack of sophistication. They say too much

of the propaganda program is packaged in bureaucratic Washington without consideration for local conditions.

Instead of some heavy tomes they would like to see in American libraries simple booklets on how to repair a bicycle or dig a well.

Instead of films on art galleries in Buffalo they would like to see animated cartoons angled specifically for local audiences.

They are critical of the act of Congress which bars USIS from competing with commercial publishing houses and which, they say, stifles USIS publications.

Some are critical of the fact that non-American authors are barred from American library shelves.

But if USIS is criticized, it is also defended. Some point out that one of America's most successful propaganda displays—of the space program and equipment—was a packaged program from Washington.

It is argued that sackings of libraries do not always indicate defeat. Sometimes they are indications of the libraries' effectiveness, so much so that anti-American demonstrators desire to put them out of business.

Then again in one southeast Asian land where the local government is trying to improve its image in a remote and Communist-tainted region, the USIS is performing with subtlety and sophistication. Much of its effort is to bolster the government with improved propaganda techniques without ever thumping out the achievements of the United States.

And in Vietnam, although there are USIS officials of all calibers, there are men of courage, initiative, and brilliant improvisation working for the USIS in the provinces—all under the guns of the Vietcong.

"Maybe," says one American correspondent long in the Far East, "it all depends on the individual. The guy with enough dedication tempered with enough realism yet still with enough imagination and professionalism—that's the guy that seems to do a good job. But selling America in Asia is an uphill job."

"This is very professional business, and we can do without the amateurs, the bureaucrats, and the nuts."

JOHN HUGHES.

#### LATIN AMERICA

SANTIAGO.—On balance, U.S. Information Service activities in Latin America are totting up a number of solid achievements.

Surveying the hemisphere picture, correspondents of this newspaper around the hemisphere report that USIS operations spend less than their various Communist counterparts, but seem to be getting more for their money. A survey by the Christian Science Monitor shows:

USIS contributions to the press and to radio and television is reaching an ever-broadening spectrum of social classes in these countries.

Student and professional exchanges, as well as lending libraries, do undercut Communist influences in the academic circles.

Binational centers, where English is taught and special cultural programs are presented are growing popular whether in capital cities or in the countryside.

To be sure, not all USIS operations are equally successful. USIS personnel in the various cities surveyed are quick to admit their problems. Some of this trouble stems from personnel who are inadequately trained.

But the real problems which continue to defy solution result from the sudden nationalist- and Communist-inspired reaction to an international crisis, and also from the longstanding anti-Americanism based on nationalist distrust of U.S. motives in the area.

Marion Wilhelm, the Monitor's special correspondent in Mexico City, reports:

"U.S. films are getting the American image into every stratum of Mexican society from city labor unions to country teachers and municipal workers. This film audience was vastly broadened recently by organizing film clubs around the country and lending out projectors. The films are exchanged every week by mail."

Daily news reports are issued by USIS in most of the countries. They are used in varying degrees in the local newspapers. Where there are newspapers with substantial reputations, such as in Buenos Aires or Bogotá, these reports are less frequently used.

But in rural areas, they often reach a broad spectrum of provincial readers. Videotaped television programs and canned radio broadcasts also make their impact in these rural regions.

It may be that USIS operations in rural areas are more effective than in the cities. In Mexico City—and this would be true in any capital city—the Communist competition runs higher.

Another area which sometimes defies USIS treatment is the university campus. The Communists are highly active on these campuses. But every campus demonstration has its subtle checkmate in cultural inroads from USIS.

One of these is the free lending library set up in every large Latin American city, where university students may obtain books important for their course work.

USIS, through binational cultural centers in many of the countries, offers a variety of courses in English. Thousands receive such instruction in Argentina or Brazil, Colombia or Mexico, Peru, or Guatemala.

In final analysis, the success of USIS operations throughout the hemisphere, Monitor correspondents indicate, is in clear ratio to the type of personnel involved in operating the various USIS missions. The personnel has been good, often excellent, in most instances in the recent past.

Miss Wilhelm adds significantly from Mexico:

"The United States appears to be reaching more deeply into the national consciousness by the very fact that it does not subsidize its popularity."

She quotes a USIS officer in Mexico who says "Mexicans use our services because they want to, not because we pay them to do it."

This seems true throughout the hemisphere.

JAMES NELSON GOODSSELL.

#### AFRICA

CAPE TOWN.—On one of Addis Ababa's main streets is a small office building whose ground floor does one of the best businesses in the Ethiopian capital. It houses the U.S. Information Service library.

When I visited it a few months ago it was crowded with Africans studying American newspapers, books, and magazines.

"It's like this all the time," said the young librarian in charge.

In many other African countries the picture is much the same.

This speaks of the African's hunger for knowledge and also of the limited facilities for study available to him. It is not necessarily therefore a simple gage of his friendliness toward the United States. Nor of his acceptance of American propaganda.

For when passions rise against U.S. policies—such as American aid to Premier Moise Tshombe of the Congo—libraries as the most obvious American facility make easy targets for protest and attack.

There is one rule of thumb that seems to be pretty useful in judging the effectiveness of USIS. The smaller and more underdeveloped a country, the more impact USIS activities appear to have.

The information services provide not just libraries but films, lectures, pamphlets on the American culture and way of life, ma-

terial for use by newspapers, cultural exhibits. In the smaller countries the dearth of locally available books, teaching materials, films, and so on, makes USIS activities stand out.

In societies such as South Africa—with a more sophisticated population, its own libraries, a more developed economy, and better income even for Africans—the impact is less. Furthermore here no one is allowed to go out and proselytize in the African areas. Permits are required to enter them and the permits sometimes are not easy to get.

Also the effectiveness of the U.S. program depends on the attitude of the government involved. Some governments do not encourage widespread propaganda activities by foreign agencies.

Just down the street from the USIS library in Addis Ababa the Russians maintain a similar service. Some months ago it had pictures of Soviet industries and pastoral scenes in the window. It was not crowded inside.

Usually the U.S. information operation is by far the largest of its kind.

In a way it is hard for an impoverished African to relate himself to the "American way of life" depicted in USIS films, pamphlets, and books in which workers have cars and fine houses with modern equipment. It seems so far off and unattainable.

Some time ago a group of Africans were shown a film of life in an American city which happened to show white street cleaners and a white woman scrubbing floors.

"But," they said to the man showing the film, "do you really mean that white people clean their own streets and wash floors just like we do?"

Therefore there is a big gulf for USIS to bridge. It is not easy for Africans to understand that America is great not only because it is basically wealthy but because its people work hard to make it so.

This too is why Communist propaganda succeeds at times. It tells Africans that Americans are rich because they exploit other people.

To people with few worldly advantages, the call to socialism finds an answering ring. Capitalism to them means exploitation. And they equate the United States and capitalist exploitation, thanks to Communist propaganda.

But this does not mean that American propaganda goes unnoticed. For instance, large numbers of African youth want to go to the United States to study. Many more applications are received than can possibly be handled.

And there is a reservoir of goodwill in many African states for the United States. The free way of life is much admired. American power is respected.

All USIS activities are, of course, still just the matter of throwing small pebbles in a very big pond. But there is little doubt that despite setbacks information services make a contribution to a more accurate view of the United States by many Africans.

ROBERT M. HALLETT.

#### INDIA

NEW DELHI.—In India's deep south, in a region where every coconut tree then carried a Red flag, I once visited a USIS reading room. It was packed with Indians, many of them students. A majority said they were Communists.

I later twitted the Communist Chief Minister of Kerala State about the evident popularity of propaganda from the enemy camp. His reply: "Indian Communists enjoy wide horizons."

Through periods of evident tension and discord between the United States and India there has never been the slightest inclination anywhere to attack or burn a USIS library or abandon any one of the many



March 8, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1017

Scientists of Kansas State University, Manhattan, the developers of hybrid wheat, not only believe it will succeed—they think it will create a tremendous expansion of the seed industry and should provide new full- and part-time jobs for several thousand persons.

The total seed processing industry in Kansas now does a \$44 million a year business. The hybrid wheat seed industry, alone, could be expected to be worth \$100 million annually. Its economic impact should be felt in all areas of the State, says Dr. Floyd W. Smith, associate director of the Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station.

To commercially process the new hybrid wheat seeds at least 50 new industrial plants—an average of about 1 plant to every 2 Kansas counties—could be needed, Smith says. "These processing plants would be located in all parts of Kansas," the Kansas State scientists continue. He adds that his plant and job estimates are "ultraconservative."

The probability of hybrid wheat, which promises increases of 20 to 30 percent in yield, was revealed recently by Dr. Glenn H. Beck, dean of agriculture at Kansas State. Scientists largely responsible for the wheat hybrid breakthrough are Dr. R. W. Livers at the Fort Hays branch experiment station of Kansas State University; his predecessor, Dr. J. A. Wilson, now with a commercial seed company at Wichita; and their colleagues at Manhattan and Hays.

"If hybrid wheat is practical for field use, and we think it will be in 3 to 5 years," Smith says, "we may see a revolution in the manufacture of farm machinery." For example, he explains, a new type of grain drill will be needed. This, and other challenges to makers of farm equipment, will create new jobs in the agri-industries.

Because of hybrid wheat's probable success, Smith also anticipates increased use of fertilizer (already a \$50 million industry in Kansas) and more farming by irrigation. This means additional employment for persons distributing fertilizer and irrigation equipment. There also will be a special need for more skilled workers such as trained inspectors of commercial seed fields.

Hybrid wheat is certain to be adopted by all progressive wheat farmers, Smith believes. However, it will present transportation problems not encountered by sorghum hybrid seed producers. Almost 10 times as much hybrid wheat seed as hybrid sorghum seed is required to plant 1 acre. To facilitate handling the vast bulk of the hybrid wheat seed is one important reason 50 or more processing plants will be needed throughout the State. Another significant reason is the short period (about 2½ months) between the time hybrid wheat seeds will be harvested and planted.

"Most of the hybrid wheat seed will be harvested by the commercial planters in late June or early July," Smith says. "It then must be processed at the various plants, distributed to the farmers and put into the ground by late September." Producers of corn and sorghum hybrid seeds have about an 8-month period between harvest and planting.

Kansas State University began research on hybrid wheat at its Fort Hays branch in 1957. Because wheat, unlike corn or sorghum, normally is self-pollinated, the scientists faced the task of developing wheat plants which would shed pollen more freely in order to achieve cross-pollination. They have been able to accomplish this under laboratory and experimental plot conditions.

Now the seed is being tested in open fields about the State. The researchers are watching closely to see if their "miracle" seed will come through this practical test. They are confident it will.

## Housing

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Thursday, March 4, 1965, issue of the Los Angeles Times.

The Times appraises various of the objectives and the apparent potential results of the administration housing program and expresses deep concern.

I believe the Los Angeles Times appraisal of the housing proposal will be of interest to the Congress.

DOES DADDY ALWAYS KNOW BEST?

President Johnson's housing message to Congress calls for conceptual departures which can only be described as incredible.

Granted, his goal of encouraging better housing and more attractive cities is "lofty and humanitarian," as House Republican Leader GERALD FORD himself recognized.

However, Mr. Johnson's proposed methods betray an eyebrow-lifting assumption that local government as we have known it is obsolete, and must serve increasingly as a mere extension of Big Brother's long arm.

The President pays lip service to local responsibility, vowing that the Federal Government can only "serve as a catalyst." His own words, however, show that considerably more is involved.

To encourage private construction of 500,000 dwelling units, Mr. Johnson proposes that Washington pay part of the rent for "families across a wide range of lower and moderate income brackets."

Some of these direct subsidies would go to families forced to move when their homes are demolished for community improvement projects.

The rental supplements also would go, however, to help families in the \$4,000 to \$6,500 income brackets move into better housing than they otherwise could afford.

This is a laudable objective at first sight. But the same logic could be argued for subsidies to buy better clothing, longer vacations and bigger cars.

Mr. Johnson bluntly explains, too, that the subsidies will enable "families of different income . . . to live together." In other words, he apparently has decided that it's somehow wrong for Americans to group themselves according to income, and that Washington has a responsibility to mix us all together.

This is a novel approach to Federal housing action, to say the least.

In addition, the President proposed \$100 million in Federal matching grants to help cities build "basic community facilities." He wants, too, a new program of federally insured loans for development of entire planned communities and subdivisions.

Under both these proposals, Federal aid would be contingent upon the projects being part of areawide plans approved by Washington—specifically, by the new Department of Housing and Urban Development which the administration proposes to create.

This is a sensible safeguard for the taxpayers' money. But in practice it also would transfer effective control of basically local affairs to a body of all-knowing bureaucrats in Washington.

After all, what mayor could resist this juicy Federal carrot? What incentive would

remain for communities to solve their own problems in their own way?

Aside from principle, the costs must be reckoned. Mr. Johnson has prudently left off the price tag for now, but his program clearly would run at least \$500 million a year from the first—and would balloon higher in future years.

President Johnson has no visible mandate from the people for such a fundamental shift in the functions of the local and Federal Governments. Lawmakers of both parties should withhold endorsement until and unless they are very sure this is what the American people want.

## The Sino-Soviet Conflict—Part I

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific, of which I am chairman, will begin hearings on the current conflict between the two major Communist powers, the Soviet Union and Red China.

The purpose of these hearings is to put together various points of view on the Sino-Soviet dispute—its causes, effects, implications for U.S. policy and prospects for settlement.

It has been my experience that there is surprisingly little information on the split at the congressional level. There also is a serious lack of understanding by the public of the impact which the dispute is having on U.S. policy.

The hearings will, it is hoped, bring the Sino-Soviet conflict into clearer focus for those of us in Congress who will be called upon to vote on legislation affecting East-West relationships.

Among the experts who will testify during the hearings, which begin Wednesday, March 10, are the Honorable George Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, and Dr. Donald Zagoria, a professor at Columbia University and the author of the recent book, "The Sino-Soviet Conflict, 1956-1961."

Last Sunday, in its editorial section, the Washington Post published articles by both of these gentlemen on the subject of the Sino-Soviet dispute. Their views differ in emphasis, particularly on the question of the effect which United States efforts in Vietnam are having on the Sino-Soviet split.

Ambassador Kennan, now a professor at the Institute for Advanced Studies, Princeton University, believes that U.S. escalation of the conflict in southeast Asia could under certain circumstances force the Russians back into a closer relation to the Chinese.

Dr. Zagoria sees our actions in Vietnam as a cause of deepening tensions between Moscow and Peking. Because of the pertinence of these viewpoints to recent world events and the upcoming congressional inquiry, with permission I

A1018

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 8, 1965

insert in the RECORD Dr. Zagoria's article of March 7.

Also with permission I make subsequent insertions of Ambassador Kennan's article and another Washington Post editorial piece by Dr. Zagoria, which was published January 31. It is my earnest hope that these articles will be given careful attention by my colleagues.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,  
Mar. 7, 1965]

UNITED STATES BOMBS WIDEN SINO-SOVIET  
SPLIT—LIMITED ESCALATION IN VIETNAM  
COULD HELP CREATE CONDITIONS FOR NE-  
GOTIATED SETTLEMENT

(By Donald S. Zagoria)

The most significant consequence of the American bombings of North Vietnam is the widening of the Sino-Soviet split. Instead of bringing the two Communist giants closer together—the possibility feared by many Americans—the limited escalation of the war has so far produced precisely the opposite effect. History may thus be repeating itself.

The Cuban missile confrontation in 1962 also exacerbated the Sino-Soviet dispute and ended in Peiping's accusing Moscow of "capitulationism" while Moscow accused Peiping of "adventurism."

The evidence of the widening split on Vietnam is increasing. Chinese students demonstrating in Moscow a few days ago accused the Russians of collaborating with the "imperialists" in Vietnam by not taking stronger actions against American bombing.

Meanwhile, Soviet sources in southeast Asia are reportedly charging that the Vietcong attack on the American installation at Pleiku was a deliberate provocation designed to force an American response, which would in turn force the Soviet hand.

#### DIFFERENCE OF DEGREE

The immediate question at issue between Moscow and Peiping seems to be the preconditions for negotiation over Vietnam. During the past few weeks, Moscow and Peiping have voiced opposing views on this matter.

Moscow has not been as adamant as Peiping about the withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam as a prerequisite for negotiations. While Peiping's Foreign Minister, Chen Yi, insisted that American withdrawal was necessary before a settlement was possible, Soviet Premier Kossygin said that only an end of American bombing attacks on North Vietnam was needed, first and foremost, to create conditions for negotiations.

#### NO BLANK CHECK

That there exists such a dispute between Peiping and Moscow is also suggested by the recent Albanian charge that Kossygin has advised the North Vietnamese to negotiate with the United States on the basis of the continued presence of the American forces in South Vietnam.

Finally, Peiping has indirectly warned against any negotiations that would give the outward appearance of fairplay and give the United States a breathing spell.

These differences between Moscow and Peiping clearly reflect a much broader disparity of interest. Russia cannot afford to appear impotent in the face of continued American attacks on a Communist state, but neither is it interested in giving a blank check to Peiping and Hanoi that would enable them to suck Moscow into a confrontation with the United States.

Peiping sees a golden opportunity to exploit the Soviet dilemma. Optimally, the Chinese would like to force Moscow into a confrontation with the United States in southeast Asia that would end the Soviet-American detente, a goal Peiping has sought consistently over the past 5 years. If this were to take place, and the United States

backed down, there would be further proof of the correctness of Maoist revolutionary strategy.

If Moscow refuses to play this game, as it has so far, the Chinese will accuse the Russians of "capitulationism" and hope thereby to gain increased influence in the more revolutionary section of the international Communist movement.

The Chinese, in short, have much to gain by opposing negotiations at this point while the Russians would like to extricate themselves from the dilemma, and a negotiated settlement is the only way out. This is why Peiping insists on American withdrawal as indispensable to negotiations—terms which Peiping knows are unacceptable to Washington—while Moscow urges Hanoi to be more flexible.

This is not to say that the Russians are primarily interested in pulling American chestnuts out of the Vietnamese fire. Moscow has its own hand to play.

#### A RESTRAINT, AT LEAST

Nevertheless, the Russian desire to bring an end to the war before Moscow is forced to choose between equally unpalatable alternatives does provide the germ of a common American-Soviet interest. At the very least, it acts as a restraining factor on Hanoi.

This situation can be exploited by a subtle and flexible American policy. The U.S. objective should be to take advantage of the common interest emerging between Moscow and Washington in bringing the war to an end on terms acceptable to both sides and thereby help substitute Soviet for Chinese influence in Hanoi. We have contributed to this common interest by our limited escalation of the war, which has enabled the Russians to impress on Hanoi the desirability of early negotiations.

Thus, by continuing this limited escalation—but keeping it within well-defined limits for the time being so as not to push the Russians too hard—we would be giving them one of two kinds of arguments they need in Hanoi.

But at the same time that we provide the Russians with sticks to impress Hanoi, we must also provide them with carrots to enable them to sustain their difficult game. Peiping is undoubtedly now telling Hanoi that the Americans will not settle on any reasonable terms until they are decisively defeated and humiliated on the battlefield. For the Russians to counter this argument in Hanoi, they must know what terms are acceptable to us and these terms must be sufficiently realistic to tempt Hanoi to bargain.

#### HONEY ON THE STICK

In exchange for a cessation of infiltration of men and arms into South Vietnam, which we are now correctly insisting upon, we should at the same time hold out to Hanoi the future prospect of economic assistance, diplomatic recognition, and an eventual close association with a friendly, but, independent, South Vietnam.

We should also continue to hold out the prospect already suggested by Secretary of State Rusk of an international effort to assist the economic and social development of the entire Indochinese peninsula. We should, in effect, demonstrate our willingness to recognize the legitimacy of the North Vietnamese Government and to further its economic development. It was, in part at least, a desperate economic situation at home that led Hanoi into sponsoring an armed takeover of South Vietnam in the first place, beginning in 1958.

With the widening of the Sino-Soviet split, we have reached a dramatic new turn in events that could pave the way to a settlement between North and South Vietnam. This would take place in the broader context of a common interest between Moscow and Washington in not allowing Peiping to be

the victor in Soviet-American confrontation in which both have much to lose and nothing to gain.

## Voice of Democracy Contest

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year, over a quarter of a million high school students participated in the contest, with the winning contestant from each State to be brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to submit the winning speech of Miss Barbara Jean Urso of Detroit, Mich., who is a resident of my congressional district:

#### THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP, 1964-65

(By Barbara Jean Urso, Detroit, Mich.)

I've been doing a great deal of thinking about this challenge of citizenship, and I've come to see citizenship as quite a bit more than paying your taxes, voting, reading the newspapers, and abiding by the laws. We can do all of these things out of habit, curiosity, or fear, and fail to find the true value of citizenship.

I feel that, in order for something to be really challenged, it must possess certain qualities which are, in reality, being challenged.

I think that, in order to be a real citizen, one must possess courage to defend one's convictions; love of family, of country, and most of all, of one's God. Thus, the challenge is not simply a threat to one's technical duties and privileges, but is, in fact, a direct questioning of one's courage and one's sense of morality.

I didn't realize this was so until late one night as I watched the 11 o'clock news. A Negro church in Alabama had been bombed. This was really nothing startling until I realized that four children had been murdered in a house of prayer. In the following months, in many places both North and South alike, life became such a harrowing experience that a man's right to walk a public street was being contested. His right of assembly, of worship, in short his right to exist was being challenged. He accepted the challenge, and he was not alone.

You see, in the North and South there were young people, like you and me, who were willing and eager to help him. I learned then of Andy Goodman, James Chaney, and Mickey Schwerner. To some people, they were "brash, young punks, meddling in affairs which were none of their business." To others, they were crusaders in a holy war, a moral war against terror and injustice.

Perhaps, as some people suggested, they were meddling. Perhaps these same people would be the type who bolted their doors, shut their lights, and peered cautiously from drawn shades while a woman, who was being attacked on their doorstep, screamed for help unheeded. The people who squirm and then turn their backs on involvement.

But when I think of citizenship now, and I think of it often, I think of Goodman, Chaney, and Schwerner, and I thank God that there are those who have accepted the challenge of citizenship and who commit themselves to the defense of human rights. For, after all, are we not all committed to



# House of Representatives

MONDAY, MARCH 8, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted from the epistle of I Peter 5: 7: *Cast all your care upon Him, for He careth for you.*

Let us pray:

O Thou who art the Lord God Almighty, grant that we may meet the duties and responsibilities of this new week with a resolute faith in the guiding and sustaining presence of Thy spirit.

May we share the blessings of Thy divine providence with the needy members of the human family and in a spirit that is truly indicative of a personal interest in their welfare and happiness.

Inspire us with a clear understanding and appreciation of the greatness and glory of the ideals and principles of our democracy which we cherish.

May we feel the constraints and certainty of its ultimate triumph when men and nations shall be members of the kingdom of peace and brotherhood.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 5, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. SIKES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

## THE SELMA, ALA., SITUATION

(Mr. O'HARA of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at Selma yesterday, a savage attack was made upon American citizens attempting to secure their right to vote. This storm-trooper-style action was undertaken at the direction of a reckless demagog. It must have shocked and shamed every decent American.

Our Speaker, JOHN McCORMACK, properly described yesterday's unconscionable activities at his press conference this morning as a "disgraceful exhibition of arbitrary power."

In this connection, it is interesting to note that the advocates of States rights now are calling for a convention

to amend our Constitution. If this misguided effort succeeds, the first duty of such a convention should be a reexamination of the doctrine of States rights as it affects constitutional rights.

The people of the United States cannot and will not condone outrages such as that which occurred at Selma yesterday.

## STATE DEPARTMENT'S WHITE PAPER ON VIETNAM

(Mr. MORRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend I read an advertisement appearing in the New York Times called a reply to the State Department's white paper on Vietnam.

Apparently this advertisement is the brainchild of a publication known as I. F. Stone's Weekly. Fronting for this so-called independent weekly newspaper in solicitation of funds for a surrender in South Vietnam is a Dr. H. A. Crosby Forbes. As you can imagine, this article is critical of our actions and policies in South Vietnam and suggests very strongly that we should surrender and leave the people of South Vietnam to the Communists who are determined to force their will upon all freedom-loving people. Their arguments for surrender are just as shortsighted as Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain's theory of "peace at any price" during the late 1930's in the United Kingdom's relations with Nazi Germany.

This article states that the North Vietnamese support for guerrillas in South Vietnam is no more of a secret than the U.S. support of the South Vietnamese Government against them. This is true but there is one very, very basic difference in these two positions—the U.S. Government is in South Vietnam at the invitation and urging of the South Vietnamese Government. The North Vietnamese Communists are supporting naked aggression against their neighbors, the south.

Stone's Weekly also suggested that we and the South Vietnamese Government have violated the Geneva Agreement on the partition of Indochina. We have not violated any such agreement because neither the United States nor the South Vietnamese Government were signatories to the Geneva accords.

It is time to support our President's position in Vietnam, instead of gutter-snipe attacks.

## SCHEDULE FOR HEARINGS ON PRIVATE IMMIGRATION BILLS

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, many Members have inquired of me concerning the progress being made by the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality on private bills which they have introduced. I am sure other Members who have introduced private bills are similarly interested.

Early in January, I requested the counsel assigned to the subcommittee by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] to prepare a list of the bills ready for consideration, together with a summary of the individual case involved and to present this material to me as chairman of the subcommittee. Mr. Cline, the counsel assigned, has not yet met this request. As a consequence, the subcommittee has not been in a position to consider any of the pending private bills. As soon as the counsel assigned to the subcommittee meets my request, our subcommittee will then be in a position to announce hearings on private bills.

## LAW ENFORCEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 103)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Crime has become a malignant enemy in America's midst.

Since 1940 the crime rate in this country has doubled. It has increased five times as fast as our population since 1958.

In dollars the cost of crime runs to tens of billions annually. The human costs are simply not measurable.

The problems run deep and will not yield to quick and easy answers. We must identify and eliminate the causes of criminal activity whether they lie in the environment around us or deep in the nature of individual men. This is a major purpose of all we are doing in combating poverty and improving education, health, welfare, housing, and recreation.

All these are vital, but they are not enough. Crime will not wait while we pull it up by the roots. We must arrest and reverse the trend toward lawlessness.

This active combat against crime calls for a fair and efficient system of law enforcement to deal with those who break our laws. It means giving new priority to the methods and institutions of law enforcement—

March 8, 1965

To our police, who are our frontline, both offensive and defensive, in the fight against crime. There is a great need not only for improved training of police—ment but for all people to learn about, to understand, and to assist the policeman in his work;

To our courts, traditionally the symbol and guardian of our cherished freedoms. Local criminal courts are so overloaded that their functioning is impeded and their effectiveness weakened. More courts and judges is one answer, but every possibility of improvement must be explored;

To our correctional agencies. We cannot tolerate an endless, self-defeating cycle of imprisonment, release, and re-imprisonment which fails to alter undesirable attitudes and behavior. We must find ways to help the first offenders avoid a continuing career of crime.

No right is more elemental to our society than the right to personal security and no right needs more urgent protection.

Our streets must be safe. Our homes and places of business must be secure. Experience and wisdom dictate that one of the most legitimate functions of government is the preservation of law and order.

Our system rejects the concept of a national police force. The protection responsibilities lie primarily with State and local governments.

That is right and proper.

Yet, crime is no longer merely a local problem. Every city, every State is troubled by the same hard statistical—and human—facts. The extent and seriousness of the problem have made it of great national concern.

Crime is as old as history. It is hardly new to America. But in our increasingly mobile, urban society, crime problems are not only greater, they are immensely more complex.

We have not stood idly by in the face of these problems. Many cities and States, as well as the Federal Government, have developed new programs reflecting their growing concern.

Yet the crime rate continues to increase.

The time has come now to check that growth, to contain its spread, and to reduce its toll of lives and property.

I believe the way to do so is to give new recognition to the fact that crime is a national problem—and to intensify our crime prevention and crime fighting at all levels of government.

#### THE ROLE OF THE INDIVIDUAL

The starting point for such efforts is the individual citizen. Law enforcement cannot succeed without the sustained—and informed—interest of all citizens.

It is not enough to reflect our concern over the rise in crime by seeking out single answers or simple answers. They do not exist. The people will get observance of the law and enforcement of the law if they want it, insist on it, and participate in it.

It has been said, for example, that the fault lies with courts which "coddle criminals," or, on the other hand, that police officers do not observe the rights of the individual.

There is misunderstanding at times between law enforcement officers and some courts. We need to think less, however, about taking sides in such controversies and more about our common objective: law enforcement which is both fair and effective. We are not prepared in our democratic system to pay for improved law enforcement by unreasonable limitations on the individual protections which ennoble our system. Yet there is the undoubted necessity that society be protected from the criminal and that the rights of society be recognized along with the rights of the individual.

As Mr. Justice Frankfurter once said:

A democratic society, in which respect for the dignity of all men is central, naturally guards against the misuse of the law enforcement process.

It has been said that the fault lies in poor living conditions, limited education, and the denial of opportunity.

Plainly, laws are less likely to command the respect of those forced to live at the margins of our society. Stability and order have little meaning and small advantage to those who exist in poverty, hopelessness, and despair.

The longrun solution to this view of crime in jobs, education, and hope. This is a goal to which this country is now committed. But we should remember that not all crime is committed by those who are impoverished or those denied equal opportunity. In any event, we cannot postpone our responsibilities to act against crimes committed today.

It has also been said that the fault lies in a deep moral decay, particularly among the young; that juvenile delinquency and high crime rates among younger adults have their origins in this decay.

In our increasingly complex society, it is becoming harder to perceive and maintain clear moral values. But the great majority of our young people lead law-abiding, creative lives. We need only look to the spirit which characterizes our youth today—the spirit of the Peace Corps, of VISTA, of commitment to the well-being and welfare of society. While crime by young people in our society is of very serious concern, it involves only a small proportion of our youth.

We must, in short, understand that the reasons for the growth of crime are many and complicated. We must accept hard facts at every turn. But like the related problems of poverty and of education, we must face them squarely if we are to succeed. And we must succeed.

Thus, while recognizing that the basic responsibility rests on local authorities, we must also recognize the burdens they now bear. To assist them in bearing these burdens successfully, I propose—

Increased Federal law-enforcement efforts;

Assistance to local law-enforcement efforts;

A comprehensive, penetrating analysis of the origins and nature of crime in modern America.

#### FEDERAL LAW-ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS

The average citizen is most directly concerned with what is called crime in the streets. Crime of this kind—rob-

beries, muggings, housebreakings—are the primary law-enforcement responsibility of State and local governments. When criminals cross State lines, however, Federal enforcement is also available. Thus, Federal, State and local investigators may all join to pursue the bank robber, the kidnapper or the auto thief. Federal assistance in these activities has been and can continue to be helpful.

In some areas, however, the Federal Government has a special responsibility—organized crime, narcotic and drug control, regulation of gun sales, and law-enforcement activities in the District of Columbia.

#### 1. ORGANIZED CRIME

Organized crime is a cancer in the city. It has become an entrenched national industry. It embraces gambling, narcotics, stock and bankruptcy fraud, usurious loans, or corruption of public officials or labor-management relations.

Racketeering feeds on itself. Illegal gambling, for example, channels enormous profits to other criminal avenues. The citizen is the loser.

Organized crime also breeds lesser crime. The police in our large cities know from daily experience how much street crime results, for example, from narcotics addiction.

Perhaps the most alarming aspect of organized crime, however, is that it erodes respect for the law. Corrupting a public official may lend respectability to the racketeer, as it destroys the underpinning of law enforcement in a community.

Since 1961, the Federal Government has responded to this challenge in force. We have secured new legislative authority. We have achieved new levels of cooperation among the 26 different Federal law-enforcement agencies. We have achieved new prosecutive energy. The result has been a tenfold increase in racketeering convictions.

But this accomplishment represents a mere beginning. Much remains to be done.

Consequently, I am calling on the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the other heads of the Federal law enforcement arms to enlarge their energetic effort against organized crime. The Department of Justice will submit legislative proposals to the Congress to strengthen and expand these efforts generally.

I urge the prompt enactment of these measures.

#### 2. DRUG CONTROL

The return of narcotic and marihuana users to useful, productive lives is of obvious benefit to them and to society at large. But at the same time, it is essential to assure adequate protection of the general public.

To meet these objectives, the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse recommended enactment of a Federal civil commitment statute to provide an alternative means of dealing with those narcotic and marihuana users likely to respond to treatment and achieve rehabilitation. The Commission also recommended that those penalty provisions of the Federal



March 8, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

4223

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in commenting on the article I call attention to the fact that on May 26, 1964, the Senate unanimously adopted Senate Resolution 332, of which I, along with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] was the sponsor. I quote from the resolution because it is pertinent to this subject.

*Resolved*, That the Attorney General is requested to investigate the alleged solicitation of career employees by either political party to purchase tickets to political fundraising dinners for the purpose of ascertaining whether such solicitation by either political party has involved a violation of existing laws, and (1) if it appears that any such violation has occurred, to take appropriate steps to punish those responsible therefor, or (2) if it appears that the alleged solicitation was not in violation of existing laws, to formulate and recommend to the Congress, within sixty days, the enactment of such additional laws, or amendments to existing laws, as may be necessary to prohibit further solicitations of this nature.

Mr. President, this resolution was unanimously adopted by the Senate. It has not been 60 days, but 6 months, since this resolution was adopted, we are still waiting for a report from the Attorney General's office as to what he has found as a result of the investigation which we instructed him to conduct.

Perhaps the Attorney General can find time to tell us what the FBI found when these charges were investigated—that is if they were investigated.

#### THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, times of great national crisis, when American bombs are being dropped, and American lives are being lost, the easiest course for any newspaper to take is the belligerent stance of "Hit 'em again, harder." An American newspaper which deserves the highest commendation for restraining itself during this current crisis is the New York Times. The editorial "Negotiate or Escalate," which appeared in the February 25 issue, is one of a long, distinguished series of articles on Vietnam which have appeared in the New York Times during recent months.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial and another fine editorial entitled, "Realities Become Clearer," from the February 23 issue of the Detroit Free Press, inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 25, 1965]

#### NEGOTIATE OR ESCALATE

It is time for someone in Washington to remember John F. Kennedy's words in his inaugural address: "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

The pressures on this country to seek a negotiated settlement of the Vietnamese conflict are approaching a point where the United States is being isolated. In recent days Russia has joined France in appealing for talks; the British would like to see negotiations started; the news from North Vietnam hints at a desire to confer; India had previously expressed the same wish, and yesterday Secretary General Thant of the United Nations disclosed that he has been engaged

in discussions with the United States and other involved nations and has made concrete proposals for a negotiated settlement.

Washington, to be sure, is not quite alone. Communist China has been adamant against negotiations, and it is quit possible that Peiping will refuse to talk. However, Mr. Thant, President de Gaulle and the Russians believe that China can be induced to join a reconvened meeting of the 14-nation Geneva Conference.

Yesterday it was announced that American jet bombers, with Americans manning the weapons as well as the controls, are now fighting in Vietnam. Their involvement makes Americans open combatants in the war, not just advisers; thus the conflict has again been escalated. Correspondents in Washington are being informed that U.S. policy now permits attacks on North Vietnam even without further provocations. The point of no return on a wider war may be at hand.

A State Department spokesman goes on repeating that the United States will reject negotiations so long as Hanoi supports the Vietcong guerrillas; Peiping says it will not talk until all American troops are out of Vietnam. Both preconditions are utterly unrealistic. One of the fundamental reasons for negotiations is precisely to arrange for a cease-fire and nonintervention.

Unquestionably, President Johnson worries about the effect on South Vietnamese morale of any move toward negotiations, but the recent upheavals in Saigon have indicated that the will to resist the Vietcong, even among the commanders of the armed forces, is already near the vanishing point.

Time is working against the United States. Secretary Thant is right in saying that the situation is going "from bad to worse." The notion that to negotiate would be a defeat for the United States has become one of the most pernicious misapprehensions of the conflict. The United States is amply proving its military strength and its determination to stay in South Vietnam in present circumstances. An agreement to negotiate surrenders nothings; it opens up the possibility for determining whether the goals of effective neutralization now being sought militarily can be achieved at the conference table.

The most significant thing that Secretary Thant said yesterday was this: "I am sure that the great American people, if it only knows the true facts, will agree with me that further bloodshed is unnecessary and that political and diplomatic negotiations alone can create conditions that will enable the United States to withdraw gracefully from that part of the world."

President Johnson is the man to whom the American people look for the true facts.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Feb. 23, 1965]

#### REALITIES BECOME CLEARER

Saigon's coveters of power have been at each other's throats again. As usual, only two things can be said with certainty.

One is that whichever faction winds up in possession of the symbols of government, it will hold them only briefly. The other is that real government will not exist.

The war against the Vietcong rebels will be prosecuted only feebly, and concern for South Vietnam's bedeviled people will be nil.

All of which renders the assignment which the United States has given itself in South Vietnam impossible. We cannot assist a nation to win a war when interest is lacking at every level.

Moreover, as truth has finally emerged, it becomes evident that while the South Vietnam war has multiple facets, its chief characteristic is that of a civil war. And outsiders have no business intervening in civil wars.

Unfortunately, the United States has gotten so involved that we can hardly pile our people aboard homeward bound ships and planes and stop writing checks.

However, nothing but folly prevents the United States from changing course—accepting realities which became evident months ago.

What we need is not more scuffling on hopeless battlefields, but a search for some formula, some accommodation which will permit a truce, and provide footing for permanent peace.

Had the past couple of years seen as much zeal put into this search as has been given to the compounding of futilities, both this country and South Vietnam would have been better served.

While the successive coups say nothing for South Vietnam's ability to attain self-government, they may have the virtue of shaking our policymakers awake. In that light, the latest one may not be all bad news. At least it cannot breed more chaos than there already was.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 67, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, the so-called Monroney resolution, and that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a joint committee on the organization of the Congress, was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of six Members of the Senate (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. No recommendation shall be made by the committee except upon a majority vote of the Members representing each House, taken separately.

Sec. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of the respective Houses and officers and employees of the committees and Members of Congress; and the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress: *Provided*, That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the

floor of either House: *Provided further*, That the language employed herein shall not prohibit the committee from studying and recommending the consolidations and reorganization of committees.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-ninth Congress, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$150,000 through January 31, 1966, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

(d) The committee shall report from time to time to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study, together with its recommendations, the first report being made not later than one hundred and twenty days after the effective date of this concurrent resolution. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned, the report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be. All reports and findings of the committee shall, when received, be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the appropriate committees of the House.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

#### VA ADMINISTRATOR, WILLIAM J. DRIVER APPLAUDS GI BILL

**Mr. YARBOROUGH.** Mr. President, in the course of past hearings conducted on the cold war GI bill the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs has had the privilege of hearing testimony from numerous outstanding leaders in both the arts and the sciences in support of this worthy and necessary legislation. Many of these prominent citizens look back with pride upon the fact that without the valuable economic assistance provided them by the GI bills of World War II and the Korean war, they would have been unable to further their education and thus attain the positions of leadership and responsibility which they occupy today.

One of these prominent leaders on the American scene who recognizes the value of the GI bills is the new Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, Mr. William J. Driver. Mr. Driver expressed his personal indebtedness to the GI bill in an illuminating article which appeared in the February 1965 issue of the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine. He said he might not have finished law school and probably would not now be Administrator had it not been for such bills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article indicating Mr.

Driver's recognition of the benefits provided by the GI bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**NEW VA ADMINISTRATOR: WILLIAM J. DRIVER**  
At 8 a.m. on January 4, William J. Driver walked across the hall from his old office, crossed the threshold of another marked Administrator, and assumed his duties as head of the largest independent agency of the U.S. Government.

Those steps set a first.

As the President commented, when he announced his intention in late December to nominate the Deputy Administrator to succeed John S. Gleason, Jr., as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. Driver is the first Federal career official to direct the affairs of America's former servicemen and women.

Mr. Driver, at 46, is the second youngest VA Administrator. Gleason was 45 when he took the oath of office in 1961.

Gleason's resignation, effective January 1, was tendered to allow him to resume a banking career and direct other business enterprises in Chicago.

The announcement of Driver's appointment was highly pleasing to officers of the Veterans of Foreign Wars who actively supported his nomination to the high post. He is a life member of VFW Post 8816, Rochester, N.Y.

The new Administrator is a 6-foot-3, 190 pound veteran of World War II and Korea who has spent 16 years in the Veterans' Administration.

Driver has a common interest with the 8 million World War II veterans who took advantage of the GI bill to further their education and reclaim the classroom opportunities they lost temporarily while in uniform. Early after his association with the VA in Washington, he attended law school at night under the GI measure and earned his LL.B. degree in 1952.

A grateful beneficiary of this wartime legislation, he told newsmen shortly after the announcement of his appointment as Administrator:

"I wouldn't have made it through law school without the GI bill. So you might say I wouldn't be here today without it."

The new Administrator's earlier education was received in his native Rochester, N.Y., where he was graduated from high school and from Niagara University. At Niagara he underwrote his college expenses by working with a Rochester insurance firm before receiving his degree in business administration cum laude in 1941.

Administrator Driver served during World War II as a commissioned officer with Headquarters, Adjutant General, European Theater, from 1942 until his separation in 1946. His military decorations include recognition from Great Britain, France, and the United States. He holds the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star, the Order of the British Empire and the French Croix de Guerre.

Driver joined the VA in 1946 as special assistant to the Assistant Administrator for Contact and Administrative Services.

During the Korean conflict he returned to duties with the U.S. Army and served with the office of the Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1. He returned to the VA in August 1953.

His postwar VA career included duties with the Compensation and Pension Service, and later as Chief Benefits Director before becoming Deputy Administrator in February 1961.

Driver holds the VA's two highest awards: The Exceptional Service Medal and the Meritorious Service Medal.

His distinguished record of service won for him, at our 1964 National Convention, the VFW Medal of Merit and these richly

earned words from Past Commander in Chief Joseph J. Lombardo: "In appreciation of your personal cooperation with the VFW and for your exemplary record as an exceptionally able administrator recognized as one of the top career officials in the Federal Government."

The National Civil Service League also took cognizance of Mr. Driver's unique achievements by giving him its Career Service Award as one of the 10 outstanding men in Federal public service.

On the occasion of that honor, Gleason told Driver that "Your selection for a 1964 Career Civil Service Award reflects two facts. Primarily, of course, the selection stems from the significant contributions that you have made in your 16 years with the Veterans' Administration, most notably your initiating or bringing to fruition:

"A new veterans pension law, Public Law 86-211, which is more equitable to veterans and taxpayers.

"The work measurement and performance standards program which provides knowledge essential in improving our ability to render service.

"The large scale application to veterans benefits of automatic data processing and the establishment of a new Department of Data Management to assure achievement of the full potential of advanced electronic management tools.

"Equally important, your selection for this high award is in reality a tribute to the quality and dedication of the employees of the Veterans' Administration. The honor you have won further confirms the conclusion I reached shortly after I became Administrator of Veterans Affairs: that in my years of experience in banking and business, and in military affairs, I have never known a group more devoted, diligent, and productive than those who serve their country through their work in the Veterans' Administration."

Mr. Driver is in hearty agreement with that evaluation of VA employees.

"They're a great group of people," Driver declared. "Their teamwork and devotion to duty has astounded every Administrator. I am aware that the Administrator gives broad policy guidance in the conduct of VA operations, but it is the individual employee who gives the Veterans' Administration a continuity of purpose to the humanitarian service for which our agency exists."

During his 16 years of association with the VA and his steady advancement to more important duties, Driver has been eminently successful at thinking for himself and encouraging others to think for themselves. The popular cliches of conformity just don't fit him. His years in Government service have sharpened his sense of the critical importance of teamwork whether it be high-level administrative decisions or direct personal service to veterans. But he has never lost sight of the value and role of each individual on the team.

And he has never lost sight of the mission of the VA.

"We are in business to provide high-quality service to which our veterans and their dependents are entitled," he has said. "The VA is a big agency which produces a lot of statistics, but we do not deal in statistics. We deal with human beings. The statistics are but a measuring rod of the individual human impact that VA makes each day and each hour on the important, individual concerns of people."

#### THE ALABAMA TRAGEDY

**Mr. YARBOROUGH.** Mr. President, we cannot win the war for liberty and democracy and freedom of opportunity around the world by losing it at home.



March 8, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

4201

and is probably the next logical step in filling in and rounding out our educational system. Dr. Bethel had helped Israel, Mexico, and Puerto Rico to set up schooling for careers in the soft-goods industries.

Before coming to the Fashion Institute, he was director, from 1937 to 1953, of New Haven College, a community college operating at Yale University. He had lectured on Industrial Administration at Yale from 1950 to 1952.

Earlier he held administrative posts with the Hamden High School, Hasbrouck Heights, N.J., High School; Nevada, Mo., High School, and Adrian, Mo., High School.

## HELD YALE DOCTORATE

He was born in Warrensburg, Mo., and graduated from Central Missouri State College in 1928. He held a master of arts degree from Columbia and a Ph. D. from Yale.

Dr. Bethel had edited and was coauthor of three textbooks on industrial management.

A former president of the American Association of Junior Colleges, he was a director of the Council of Higher Education Institutions of New York City and a member of the State Advisory Council on Higher Education.

Surviving are his widow, the former Lola Cavan; two daughters, Mrs. Douglas McGregor and Kathleen; three sisters, Mrs. Robert Blockman, Mrs. Robert Powell, and Mrs. Curtly De Witt, and one grandchild.

A memorial service will be held at 4 p.m. in the Congregational Church of the Redeemer in New Haven.

## THE SITUATION IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 10 minutes on a certain subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, anyone who has been listening to the radio and watching television, or reading the papers today cannot help but be shocked by the exercise in terror which goes under the name of police action in Selma, Ala., as illustrated yesterday by the breaking up—with great violence, many injuries, and hospitalizations—a peaceful, nonviolent march of 600 Negroes who were seeking to assert their constitutional rights of free speech and petition. I use every word with great understanding, as a lawyer, of what the words mean. That is what they were doing in their march.

I am lawyer enough to know that it must be assumed they were well aware of the order of Governor Wallace which said that such a march should not take place. But I have very grave doubt as to the legality of this order. These orders have been tested before in the courts.

Yesterday in Selma a disgraceful display of terror was used to inhibit the exercise by citizens of their constitutional rights, and their right to test whether or not those rights existed in a given situation.

It is one thing to arrest Negroes, even if they are arrested under some phony statute which does not have a basis in law, or on an order of the director of public safety, a police chief, or a Governor, which orders have no basis in the law.

That is very different from breaking up a peaceful, nonviolent exercise with the use of terror. It is at the least an effort to negate the law.

It seems very clear that wise government would never indulge in such action. That statement is true without regard to the intentions of those who promoted the march. Perhaps their intention is to invite just such violence, but their intention has no bearing on the matter.

There is in Selma, a direct confrontation between the United States and the State of Alabama. This situation has arisen before. President Eisenhower, under the authority of title 10, section 333 of the United States Code, sent troops to Little Rock to deal with such a situation. That section reads as follows:

The President, by using the militia or the armed forces, or both, or by any other means, shall take such measures as he considers necessary to suppress, in a State, any insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy, if it—

(1) so hinders the execution of the laws of that State, and of the United States within the State that any part or class of its people is deprived of a right, privilege, immunity or protection named in the Constitution and secured by law, and the constituted authorities of that State are unable, fail, or refuse to protect that right, privilege or immunity, or to give that protection; or

(2) opposes or obstructs the execution of the laws of the United States or impedes the course of justice under those laws.

In any situation covered by clause (1), the State shall be considered to have denied the equal protection of the laws secured by the Constitution.

Later, President Kennedy, acting under the same statute, sent U.S. marshals to Alabama to deal with a similar situation. There was also an occurrence of this kind in Mississippi.

It seems to me that the time has come to act. The subjecting of American citizens to brutality inflicted under the color of law is both senseless and shocking.

The law is quite adequate to give the President power to proceed. I think, in all fairness, that anyone who has seen or read of this occurrence must come to the conclusion that affairs in Alabama have gotten completely out of hand.

There is no reason why the President cannot declare that the incidents in Selma do not represent law and order as we know it in our country. The Selma police have taken the law into their own hands. Abdication of law for anarchy is equally bad for whites and Negroes and it is unconscionable for the police to substitute their terror for law.

In view of the bloody heads and terror-filled attacks which have been reported, it is indeed a grim Monday morning if we say that the Federal Government has no responsibility to maintain law and order. It has exactly that responsibility when the rights of citizens of the United States are involved as they are here.

I know that great movements do not end without some kind of sacrifice. Many sacrifices have been made in these cases. But great movements should not take place under the law of the jungle and the law of tooth and claw, but under the rule of law.

Mr. President, I end where I began. There is a confrontation between the United States and the State of Alabama. We have had such confrontations before in civil rights and we shall have them again.

This is the time when the United States must take its full responsibility to protect the lives and safety of its citizens, inasmuch as these are matters that can under law be redressed by the Federal Government. In section 902 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Congress contemplated such application in providing as follows:

Sec. 902. Whenever an action has been commenced in any court of the United States seeking relief from the denial of equal protection of the laws under the 14th amendment to the Constitution on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, the Attorney General for or in the name of the United States may intervene in such action upon timely application if the Attorney General certifies that the case is of general public importance. In such action, the United States shall be entitled to the same relief as if it had instituted the action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. There are many such actions pending, arising out of the Selma situation and I would hope that the Attorney General would carefully consider this section of the new law.

In this particular matter, as happens from time to time, we have reached the boiling point. Let us not get beyond the point of no return. It is time for the United States to assert itself in respect of Selma, Ala., in no uncertain terms and say whether or not excessive police action is violating the due process of law. It is clear that such action was taken to a degree which really was not required by the conditions, or the laws as they were interpreted by the Governor and authorities of the State of Alabama. In my judgment, this is unacceptable, to the point where the President will, I hope, assume direct authority in the situation.

## THE MESS IN VIETNAM—VI

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in a hastily conceived and clumsily executed maneuver to gloss over the actualities of the situation in Vietnam, the State Department issued its so-called white paper on Vietnam.

A leading editorial in this week's New Republic says of this publication that at its best it is "entirely unconvincing." At its worst, says the editorial, "it has a desperate purpose: to prepare the moral platform for widening the war."

I share the New Republic's mistrust of any document that seeks to persuade by half-truths, by half-quotes, by omissions, and by twisting the facts. The so-called white paper is guilty of these serious faults.

The excellent editorial in the New Republic contains a point-by-point analysis

of the white paper on Vietnam and shows that there has been an obvious attempt to mislead the American people and to use the "double think" technique of trying to convince them that black is white.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. In the same publication, in an article entitled "Not for Attribution," Alex Campbell gives a vivid account of the manner in which the white paper was issued and explained. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Campbell's article be likewise printed in the RECORD after the previous insertion at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

#### EXHIBIT 1 THE WHITE PAPER

The best that can be said about the State Department's white paper on Vietnam is that it is entirely unconvincing. The worst is that it is contradictory, illogical and misleading. It has a desperate purpose: to prepare the moral platform for widening the war. The bombs which United States and South Vietnamese attackers hurled at North Vietnam last week were probably being loaded as the white paper was distributed in Washington. Still, American sensibilities demand some small assurance that precipitous acts of war spring not from blind frustration but from considered judgment. The white paper attempts to prove that escalation is the only reasonable response to a war which is quite simply a case of "flagrant aggression" by North Vietnam.

Not even the North Vietnamese would deny that they have given the Communist Vietcong in the south some measure of military aid and moral support. It is hard enough to find a purely civil war in history, and increasingly in this century internal conflicts are attended by international kibitzers on all sides—in the Congo, the Yemen, and Cuba, no less than in Vietnam. But the State Department is out to prove much more than meddling: North Vietnam, it says, "has used every resource of its own government to carry out its carefully planned program of concealed aggression. North Vietnam's commitment to seize control of the south is no less total (equally total? or more total?) than was the commitment of the regime in North Korea in 1950." Then begins a summary of the massive evidence of North Vietnamese infiltrators make up the filled and picture-padded pages.

All the State Department's Himalayan labor has brought forth a mouse of an argument. The first conclusion made is that North Vietnamese infiltrators make up the bulk of the Vietcong forces, and 19 cases are cited as proof, complete with photographs of the men, their military history and dramatic narrative ("Then the more than 300 men began walking to the south; they marched by day, rested at night"). But of the 19 infiltrators, 16 are South Vietnamese natives who were returning to their homeland, 1 is unidentified by place of birth, and only 2 are North Vietnamese. All were captured in either 1962 or 1963, although the white paper can't be that outdated; it contains other material about 3 weeks old. In a very short section which appears to be an afterthought, six more infiltrators of North Vietnamese origin are named, without photographs or military history. They provide the only evidence for the paper's contention that "as many as 76 percent of the

more than 4,400 Vitcong who are known to have entered the south in the first 8 months of 1964 were natives of North Vietnam."

Figures are given to support the State Department's claim that "infiltrators from the north—allowing for casualties—make up the majority of the so-called hard-core Vietcong." But the white paper conspicuously ignores its own advice; it does not allow for casualties among the 19,500 confirmed and 17,550 estimated infiltrators of the past 5 years. Allowing for the generally accepted Vietcong casualty rate of 50 percent, half of the infiltrators must be removed from battle each year. In the hard-core Vietcong force of 35,000 and the full army of 115,000, that leaves a current total of only 4,200 confirmed and perhaps 3,300 more estimated infiltrators—of whom perhaps fewer than half are native North Vietnamese.

But the State Department would have it both ways: Even if careful readers of the white paper should discover that North Vietnamese aid the Vietcong in roughly the same proportion that Americans aid the Government troops, they are assured that mere numbers are unimportant. The infiltrators are as tough as tigers, and 10 feet fall. "The infiltration of 5,000 guerrilla fighters in a given year is the equivalent of marching perhaps 50,000 regular troops across the border," cautions the State Department. Though the Vietcong fights against all the State Department holds dear, neither napalm in the south nor bombs in the north seems to shake its determination. What the white paper does not explain is the stubborn courage and tenacity of the Vietcong of whatever provenance or hardness of core, year after year, for none of the usual rewards and against staggering odds of survival.

The second conclusion the white paper draws is that war material from North Vietnam and its Communist-bloc allies is pouring into the south. The paper is crowded with photographs of weapons, like a mail-order catalog, to bring home the full impact. But the long inventory of all Communist-made weapons captured from the Vietcong in an 18-month period from June 1962 to January 29, 1964, includes only 22 crew-served weapons (mortars, recoilless rifles, etc.) and 155 smaller arms, hardly enough to equip one of the 139 Vietcong companies. These weapons could have come from anywhere, including Alexandria, Va., where a private arms supplier lists almost all of the items mentioned. Communist weapons captured from the Egyptians by Israeli soldiers in 1956 turn up regularly on the open market, in enough quantities to allow any government to prove Communist involvement in the rebellion of its choice.

Before it became necessary to deny the existence of a civil war in South Vietnam, American military men admitted that about 80 percent of the Vietcong's weapons were unwittingly supplied by the United States by loss, theft, or sale by enterprising South Vietnamese. It now appears that the experts were wrong; if only 177 foreign weapons could be found in Vietcong hands in 18 months, the enemy must be 99-percent equipped with American materiel. Obviously no believable case for a claim of massive arms infiltration could be built on the official list in the white paper, even stretched as it is by the inclusion of every bullet, mess-kit, and pair of socks. And so, quite providentially, a larger supply of infiltrated arms was found in a sunken North Vietnamese junk in a southern harbor, just as the white paper was being prepared. In the annals of mystery ships, this one poses a fine puzzle. Perhaps the combined United States and South Vietnamese naval patrols are more inefficient than is usually conceded, but the ship was the first encountered in the history of the war. In any case, it hardly merits the full-throated treatment afforded by the

white paper. The ship was about the size of a Coast Guard cutter, or slightly larger than the original *Santa Maria*, carrying about one-seventieth of the tonnage of a standard World War II Liberty ship. In relation to the amount of arms supplied regularly to the South Vietnamese by the United States, its supply was insignificant.

The white paper fails to sustain its two major contentions, that there is a large, militarily crucial infiltration of both men and materiel from Hanoi. It also fails to make its political points. The State Department claims that hostilities in South Vietnam began in 1959, as "a brutal campaign of terror and armed attack inspired, directed, supplied, and controlled by the Communist regime in Hanoi." But it was the late President Diem's abolition of the elected village councils in 1956 which made South Vietnam a true dictatorship and alienated a sizable proportion of the population.

In response, the rebellion began early in 1957. It is still an ugly war. According to the white paper, the Vietcong killed 1,359 civilians last year. According to our allies the South Vietnamese, and not reported in the white paper, the United States kills about 20,000 villagers and volunteers every year, largely by napalm bombing. The white paper cites as evidence of North Vietnamese involvement a report of the International Control Commission for Vietnam, which criticized Hanoi's activities in June 1962. The paper does not include item 20 of the Commission's report, however, which charges both the United States and South Vietnam with violating the 1954 Geneva Agreement on Indochina. Nor does it mention the Commission's reported criticism on February 13 of American attacks on North Vietnam, which were called unjustified. The paper destroys all credibility when it selects those findings of the Commission which seem to help its case, and then ignores those which contradict it.

To misunderstand the war in Vietnam is to condemn the United States to dishonor, defeat or worse. The white paper repeats the misunderstandings of the last 6 years, and compounds them with deception. It is no good pretending that there is no civil war in progress in South Vietnam, and that the whole bloody business would end if North Vietnam would "leave its neighbor alone." There is no point in maintaining the fiction that the United States is involved "at the request of the people of South Vietnam," as the white paper does. There is no democratic way for the people of South Vietnam to express themselves—Diem and his successors have seen to that. If asked, and they will not be, the people of South Vietnam would doubtless want to send everyone away, Americans, Vietcong regulars and North Vietnamese. The white paper says that this war is not like any others; that is true, and banal. Like all of the guerrilla wars of our generation, this one cannot be settled one way or the other by military action. The white paper cannot change a complex political conflict into a simple case of aggression over a border.

#### EXHIBIT 2 NOT FOR ATTRIBUTION (By Alex Campbell)

Some scores of journalists were asked by telephone on Friday night, February 26, to drop by the State Department Saturday morning, to pick up a document called "Aggression From the North: The Record of North Vietnam's Campaign To Conquer South Vietnam," and to attend a briefing on it by a Government spokesman. In room 2113, the office of the State Department's News Division, the journalists were handed a bulky mimeographed document that was dated February 26 but also had on its cover,



March 8, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

4203

"For release at 6 p.m. e.s.t. Saturday, February 27. Not to be previously published, quoted from, or used in any way." After a quick glance the correspondents, who read the New York Times as a necessary part of their job, realized they had read all the juicy bits in that morning's Times.

An official of the News Division said the Government spokesman would give the briefing in room 1912. Room 1912, in another part of the building, was a big conference room, with a lecture platform and rows of comfortable chairs. The correspondents sat down and began reading "Aggression From the North" while awaiting the Government spokesman. The contents said they would find a conclusion on page 74, but "Aggression From the North" had only 71 pages, and there were 9 appendices missing as well as the conclusion. Page 5 was blank, except for the word "Map" and a caption saying, "This map shows the infiltration route from North Vietnam to the south followed by VC Sgt. Huynh Van Tay and a group of North Vietnamese Army officers and men in September 1963. Tay was captured during an engagement in Chuong Thien Province in April 1964." At the foot of page 8 it said, "Insert picture of Major Dan on this page," and in the middle of page 12 it said, "Insert picture of Thao." One or two journalists wondered aloud if it was a do-it-yourself press kit, and if they ought to start coloring Major Dan and Thao by themselves, or wait for the Government spokesman.

Other correspondents were reading in the document about Tran Quoc Dan, Nguyen Thao, and Nguyen Truc. They were infiltrators sent from the north into the south, who had soon realized from talking with the local people that what they had heard in the north about conditions in the south was wrong, so they had defected. Some correspondents wondered if the way to handle infiltrators was to send defectors back north to tell the rest of the people there how wrong they were about the south. But most thought the one honest man in the document was Nguyen Hong Thai, a defector who explained that he had begun to be depressed by combat conditions and the rigors of guerrilla life.

"Aggression From the North" had its own description of life in the south. It said, "The military and insurgency situation was complicated by a quite separate internal political struggle within South Vietnam which led in November 1963 to the removal of the Diem Government and its replacement with a new one. Effective power was placed in the hands of a military revolutionary council. There have been a number of changes in the leadership and composition of the government in Saigon in the ensuing period." Most of the journalists thought this too bald and almost as misleading as what the infiltrators from the north were told about the south.

Reading on, they learned that the infiltrators sometimes carry "a small knife that can inject poison into the body of a victim," and that they get their instructions over the official government radio in Hanoi, which sends them their orders "in veiled code." This puzzled the journalists who read on another page of the document that infiltration groups are issued "a set of black civilian pajama-like clothes, two unmarked uniforms, rubber sandals, a sweater, a hammock, mosquito netting, and waterproof sheeting." No radios.

The State Department's spokesman turned up, looking remarkably like his brother in the White House, and asked the journalists not to name him in their stories, though he would answer their questions.

"Bill," a journalist asked him, "why is this document marked for release at 6 o'clock tonight when it was in the Times this morning?"

The spokesman said stiffly that somebody's ethical standards were "different from mine, and I hope from yours."

"Bill," another journalist asked, tactfully changing the subject, "why does it say in the second paragraph of the introduction to 'Aggression from the North' that the war in Vietnam is 'a new kind of war'?"

The spokesman said there had been a steady rise in the number of infiltrators but he agreed it was "not a quantum jump." Someone asked what a quantum was. Looking more than ever like his brother, the spokesman told him.

Another correspondent wanted to know why the document finished on page 71, before the conclusion and the appendices, and where was the missing map? The spokesman had a man from the news division explain that the mimeograph that the journalists had been given was incomplete and that a full, printed version would be ready for them after the spokesman finished.

The correspondents were curious about the 81-millimeter mortars that the Vietcong are now using. They asked if these were American mortars that the Vietcong had captured. The spokesman said they were "Chinese-made copies of American weapons." The journalists wondered how he knew that. He said the Vietcong had 130 81-millimeter mortars, and the Americans in Vietnam had lost only 16, so obviously the Vietcong's mortars couldn't all be ones they had captured. He added that nothing like a majority of Vietcong weapons were captured weapons, and the Vietcong were becoming increasingly dependent on shiploads of arms from outside, as they switched to more sophisticated weapons of larger caliber. However, he admitted that the Vietcong in spite of their bigger, more sophisticated weapons seldom hurled themselves against the South Vietnamese and American forces at even battalion strength.

Finally, a journalist asked what the document meant when it said that the United States would continue necessary measures of defense against aggression from North Vietnam, until the regime in Hanoi decides to halt its intervention in the south, or until effective steps are taken to maintain peace and security in the area.

"Bill," asked the correspondent, "what is that 'or' about?"

The spokesman said he wouldn't elucidate it. "It is policy, and so has to stand on its own bottom."

As he got up to go, one correspondent remarked that "Aggression From the North" stood on its own bottom as far as he was concerned.

#### EFFORTS TO DEAL WITH RACIAL IMBALANCE IN NEW YORK PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have two other matters to discuss.

I call attention to a situation which is developing in New York relating to efforts to deal with racial imbalance in our public school system, which indicates how sharply different the situation is when the community, State, and municipal governments have an understanding of constitutional rights and equal opportunity for education, and, on the other hand, when the so-called social order is geared against it, and every step must be literally dragged out of the authorities by court action.

It is for that reason that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record various newspaper articles and editorials about the integration plan of

the city of New York in its public school system, widely published this morning.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, March 8, 1965]

GROSS INTEGRATION PLAN BACKS ALLEN ON SCHOOLS; OMITTS Busing AND PAIRING—REFORMS ADVISED—NEW GRADE PATTERNS, SHIFTING OF 32,000 STUDENTS URGED

(By Leonard Buder)

Basic changes in the city school system to provide better integration and improved education were proposed in a report made public yesterday by the Board of Education.

The plan, which would cost \$28 million to implement, was prepared under the direction of Dr. Calvin E. Gross, the deposed Superintendent of Schools.

The report did not propose the compulsory assignment of busing of white children to heavily Negro schools to correct racial imbalance. Nor did it recommend any new elementary school pairings or junior high school zoning changes to promote integration.

The introduction of such measures on a limited basis last fall evoked bitter protests from white parents and led to charges that more drastic action would be put into effect next September.

#### UPHOLDS ALLEN REPORT

The report called for the adoption, as the basis for school policy, of the recommendations made last spring by a special advisory committee appointed by Dr. James E. Allen Jr., the State education commissioner. Civil rights groups have made this a principal demand.

In addition, the report urged these specific measures:

The transfer of 32,000 sixth- and ninth-grade pupils next fall to junior and senior high schools, respectively.

The addition of a fourth year to high school programs.

The conversion of all regular academic and vocational high schools into 4-year comprehensive secondary schools by 1972-73.

The elimination of two all-Negro junior high schools next September. Twenty-eight other de facto segregated junior high schools would be closed in the following years if Negro parents were willing to send their children to integrated schools elsewhere.

The creation of six educational complexes, or clusters, to test new patterns of organization, including a 4-year middle school recommended by the State committee.

The elimination of all short-time instruction in the elementary schools by 1967-68.

Efforts to strengthen the education of the so-called disadvantaged children, including the establishment of more prekindergarten classes.

A system-wide emphasis on promoting better human relations.

#### NO COMMENT BY BOARD

Dr. Gross' report, which he completed on his final day in office last Thursday, was entitled, "Blueprint for Further Action Toward Quality Integrated Education." It was released by the board without comment.

Dr. Gross was placed on a forced leave of absence with pay, and the board is now looking to settle his \$45,000-a-year contract, which has 4 years to run. The board has expressed dissatisfaction with the superintendent's leadership during his 2 years in office, including his asserted slowness in drafting a satisfactory integration plan.

Last Friday James B. Donovan, president of the board, said the report was intended to provide a basis for further discussions and public hearings. The board is scheduled to adopt an integration plan for next fall at its meeting on April 28.

Dr. Gross noted in his preface that 9 months of "intensive study and planning" had gone into the report. Dr. Jacob Landers, assistant superintendent in charge of coordinating integration efforts, played a major role in the staff.

"The record of New York City in the field of quality integrated education is second to none among the large cities of our country," the superintendent said in his opening statement. He added: "Although much has been done, it must also be recognized that even more remains to be done."

The key recommendation in the Gross report was the proposal that the Allen committee report provide the guidelines for all school integration policies.

A major recommendation of the State committee was that the city's present 6-3-3 pattern of education (6 years of elementary school and 3 years each of junior and senior high school) be changed to a 4-4-4 arrangement.

This would provide for 4-year neighborhood primary schools; integrated 4-year middle schools, covering grades 5 through 8 and drawing pupils from a wider area; and integrated 4-year comprehensive high schools.

#### WIDE EFFECT NOTED

Although Dr. Gross in his report acted upon many of the State committee's recommendations he did not urge committing the system to a 4-4-4 pattern.

"Transformation of the school system to a 4-4-4 organization would entail the conversion of some junior high schools to high school annexes and of many elementary schools to middle schools," he said.

"The educational dimensions of the 4-year middle school remain to be explored."

In line with the State committee's recommendations, Dr. Gross proposed that the 4-year comprehensive high school become "the basic organizational unit of secondary education."

All high schools, he said, should become 4-year comprehensive schools "as rapidly as possible except for special academic high schools [the Bronx High School of Science and others] and unit trade vocational schools [such as the High School of Printing]."

However, Dr. Gross noted that because of various factors, including ethnic considerations, he was recommending for next fall that comprehensive programs on the ninth-grade level be started at only two schools—John Jay in Brooklyn and Woodrow Wilson in Queens.

Comprehensive schools provide a wide range of programs, including academic and vocational courses.

Dr. Gross emphasized that new high schools should be built in integrated and predominantly white areas. He added that a vast stepup in building was needed to provide suitable accommodations for the increased number of pupils who will be attending high schools because of their take over of ninth-grade classes from the junior high schools.

As a further step toward reducing racial imbalance, Dr. Gross proposed that Negro and Puerto Rican pupils be given the option of attending any regular city high school they chose, subject only to space limitations.

The shift of 17,616 ninth-grade pupils to the high schools next fall, as proposed by Dr. Gross, would mean a vast acceleration of a move started last September when 4,717 ninth-grade pupils were transferred.

Next fall, if the recommendations are implemented, nearly half of the city's ninth-grade pupils would be attending classes in high schools, the report said.

One reason for the shift of the ninth-grade pupils to senior high schools is that it creates room in the junior high schools for elementary school pupils. This, in turn, frees room and staff in the elementary schools so they can reduce overcrowding and add services and programs, including prekindergarten classes.

The six proposed educational complexes would establish clusters of primary schools centered on a middle school for academic and administrative purposes.

Each complex would be a somewhat autonomous unit, headed by an official who would have authority to move teachers and pupils among the member schools to provide better education and integration. Additional services, personnel, and facilities also would be given to these complexes.

The complexes would involve primary and middle schools of varying grade structures.

One would be a 4-4 complex—4-year primary schools (kindergarten through fourth grade) and a 4-year middle school (fifth through eighth grade). This would be set up in Queens and affect Junior High School 126 and Public Schools 7, 83, and 171.

#### OTHER COMPLEXES LISTED

Three would be 5-3 complexes—primary schools ranging from kindergarten through fifth grade and middle schools covering the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. These would involve the following sets of schools:

Bronx: Junior High School 22 and Public Schools 53, 90, 114, and 132.

Brooklyn: Junior High School 246 and Public Schools 92, 181, and 139.

Manhattan: Junior High School 44 and Public Schools 9, 87, 166, 191, and 199.

The remaining two complexes would be 6-3, involving no departure from the present grade pattern, although one is listed tentatively and may be shifted to a 5-3 setup. These two complexes would affect the following schools:

Brooklyn: Junior High School 162 and Public Schools 123 and 299.

Queens (tentative 6-3 arrangement): Junior High School 180 and Public Schools 104, 114, 183, 47, and 225.

The report called for public discussion and hearings on the concept of educational parks—large-scale complexes containing high schools and possibly community facilities, such as libraries and museums.

The omission of additional pairings—the most controversial feature of last fall's integration program—was in line with a promise that there would be a careful evaluation of them before new pairs were created.

At present there are five pairs in which white and Negro schools have been combined for integration purposes. In these pairings, one school takes all the pupils in the combined for certain grades and the other schools take them for the remaining grades.

#### GROSS PREPARED PLAN BUT NAME IS OMITTED

The integration plan issued yesterday by the board of education is described on its pale blue cover as "recommendations of the superintendent of schools to the board of education."

But nowhere in the 145-page report does there appear the name of Superintendent Calvin E. Gross, under whose direction it was prepared. The date on the cover is March 5, 1965, 1 day after the board placed Dr. Gross on a 3-month leave of absence with full pay after having advised him privately the week before to look for another job.

A last-minute addition to the report, written in red pencil on the cover, describes his recommendations as "proposals for discussion." Board President James B. Donovan explained on Friday that the report would become final only after full public hearings.

[No credit line given]

ORDERLY SCHOOL PLAN—INTEGRATION BLUE-PRINT AVOIDS PAIRING AND BUSING TO ACHIEVE STABLE GOALS

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

The new blueprint for "further action toward quality integrated education" in the city schools aims at bringing about a consensus. To achieve this, the superintendent

and his staff risked abandoning some of the flashy devices of integration and tried to attract attention to the long-range, orderly reorganization of the schools. There is no call for increased use of that highly publicized device—the Princeton plan, or the pairing of two schools as a means of getting a better racial mixture. The bus as a major instrument of integration has been sent back to the garage.

Instead of viewing integration as a constant reshuffling of children, the report's main efforts are directed at bringing about a stability of school attendance, without at the same time freezing the system into a segregated mold.

What are the major assumptions on which consensus could be expected to rest?

The great majority of parents, white and Negro, do not want young children to be taken out of the neighborhood school, especially when this means bus transportation.

#### FOUR-YEAR SCHOOL BACKED

The great majority of educators favor the 4-year, comprehensive high school over the 3-year school and over separate academic and vocational schools. The weakest link in the present system is widely believed to be the 3-year junior high school of grades 7, 8, and 9.

The usually unspoken but critical assumption of any successful integration plan furthermore is that it must do nothing to speed the exodus of white children as well as middle-class Negro children from the city's public schools. Consensus therefore is not only desirable but essential.

Based on these areas of substantial common ground, the new blueprint, in effect, asks parents and, of course, civil rights leaders to accept the following long-range premises:

The proposed 4-year, comprehensive high school system would be a boon to everybody. It would permit a better, more cohesive and challenging curriculum by giving all academic subjects a longer stretch of work under the same educational auspices. But since the high schools are the largest institutions and least neighborhood-bound, they already are and would most readily remain the most naturally integrated ones.

By reducing the elementary schools from 6 to 5 years—with the possibility of an eventual further reduction to 4 years—the neighborhood school is maintained. But since it is naturally most vulnerable to de facto segregation, children may move out 1 year sooner.

As children move into the new middle schools—the former junior highs—community preferences are more easily taken into account. Middle schools can, if the local parents prefer it, be situated outside a de facto segregated neighborhood.

Why have the much-advertised devices, such as pairing, been played down in the new report? A major reason is undoubtedly that most experts agreed from the outset that these devices, at best, would affect only a few children in the fringe areas of the ghettos; at worst, they would have to be constantly readjusted to shifting population.

In addition it was feared that these devices, unpopular with many white parents, would create more rather than fewer segregated schools.

What about the Allen report? That document, prepared in May of 1964 by the Advisory Committee on Human Relations and Community Tensions, appointed by Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., the State education commissioner, has been widely adopted by the civil rights leaders as a blueprint for action. In fact, one of the picketing slogans has become: "All the way with Commissioner A."

#### ALLEN REPORT ACCEPTED

Part of the effort at gaining consensus therefore appears to be the opening sentence of the new report, which says: "The super-



STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD TO THE DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE, MONDAY, MARCH 8, 1965, 10:30 A.M.

This meeting has been called to bring the conference up to date on the legislative situation, to report on leadership meetings with the President and to consider any other matters which members may wish to have considered on an informal basis.

First, the legislative situation. In the first 2 months of this session, we have disposed of just about every measure which the Senate could reasonably have been expected to consider up to this point. I want to express my deep appreciation to the chairmen and members of the committees for bringing the so-called reruns and other bills to the floor expeditiously and, to all members for their co-operation on the floor. We have been able to act on important measures in excellent time and in excellent order. I refer to the agricultural supplemental, Appalachia, water pollution, the coffee legislation, the Inter-American Development Bank, presidential succession, several Interior bills, among others.

This record which is outstanding in every respect has been achieved on an orderly schedule, with reasonable hours and an appropriate Lincoln recess. There is every reason to hope that we will be able to continue in the same fashion for the balance of the session, including the previously announced recesses, hopefully, to a midsummer adjournment.

There is, as you know, the conference report on the Inter-American Development Bank and a Disarmament Agency bill on the calendar for today. We will have, shortly, the Monroney congressional study bill. The rule 22 matter, although it will be reported as ordered, may be held up for the time being. May I say Senator Russell did not in any way request the postponement of rule 22 but the leadership on both sides desires that it be postponed temporarily. Incidentally, I saw Senator Russell last Saturday at Walter Reed and I'm happy to report he is convalescing nicely.

On the balance of the legislative program, at a recent meeting with the committee chairmen, I have been advised that committee work on other measures is proceeding very well. In that connection, may I say, that at the last leadership meeting on last Tuesday with the President—the second this session—I reported to him on the need for the executive branch to speed up the submission to the Senate of draft legislation to carry out the intent of many of the excellent presidential messages which we have had so far this session. I have been assured that this will be done.

Other than that, there is not a great deal to report on the leadership meetings. I believe the President is quite content with the progress on the legislative program in the Senate. He has not made any comment at the leadership meetings on the discussion of Vietnam on the floor or on any, repeat, any Senator's speech in connection therewith. In my judgment that is a most appropriate course for the President to follow just as the debate itself has, in general, been most appropriate and helpful from the point of view of illuminating the great complexities of this situation and its implications for the national interest. Newspaper accounts have appeared which alleged that the President and the majority leader have, in effect, twisted arms on the Vietnam issue. Because of these reports I will read what I said to the caucus on January 3 and inserted in the Record for January 22.

I would anticipate that during the years ahead, the Nation will reach decisive crossroads at several points in foreign policy. The preponderant responsibility in these matters rests with the President. He will be

confronted with grave questions not only in Vietnam but elsewhere in Asia, not only in NATO but in Europe as a whole, not only in the Congo but throughout Africa, not only with regard to fiscal difficulties but with a general organizational disarray in the United Nations.

I would hope that Democratic Members, indeed, all Senators would bear in mind at all times the great burdens which the President carries for all of us in these decisions of foreign policy. I would hope and expect that we will give him every support, by word and vote which can, in good conscience, be given. And I would hope that Members qualified in questions of foreign policy would not hesitate, after careful study, to speak out on them. Contributions have been made, from time to time, by Members of the Senate, to the more effective formulation and conduct of our foreign relations. While such contributions usually come from members of the Foreign Relations Committee, others with experience and knowledge of these matters have frequently been most helpful. And clearly, we are at a stage, now, in world developments when prudent contributions of thought and idea can be very useful.

Before opening the meeting to general discussion, I should like to fix your attention for a moment on the foreign aid legislation. I think you are all aware of the attitudes and difficulties which exist on this question and the importance which the President attaches to it. I do not expect or ask any member to forego his convictions on the bill or any part of it. But I do think we should give it every consideration and try to avoid, at all costs, getting into a protracted procedural jam over it. I would appreciate any expression of view on how this matter may be expeditiously handled.

#### JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP—STATEMENTS BY SENATOR DIRKSEN AND REPRESENTATIVE FORD ON VIETNAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the statements made by myself and Hon. GERALD FORD, a Member of the House of Representatives, in behalf of the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

##### STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

In days past, the members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership have expressed support for a stiffened American military position in South Vietnam. At the very time we spoke, the Soviet and Red Chinese regimes were warning the United States against such action and promising the North Vietnamese increased military assistance. In many nations throughout the world, Communist agents were organizing riots and demonstrations against American diplomatic establishments in an all-out propaganda drive against the United States.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has stated, as American policy, that there can be no negotiations on the Vietnamese issue so long as the Communist nations promote aggression against South Vietnam. We believe this a worthy policy. In fact, we advocated it.

We suggest that logic would have the United States carry this policy one step further.

The Soviet Union has been espousing a policy of "peaceful coexistence." This policy was welcomed by the Kennedy and Johnson administrations and numerous

moves were made to demonstrate American readiness to respond, particularly in the fields of trade, communications and diplomatic relations.

Yet the fact remains that the Soviet Union and the other Communist nations have not diminished, but stepped up, their promotion of subversion in the neutral and free-world countries. South Vietnam is only the most glaring example. The continued supplying of Cuba, the subversion in South America, notably Venezuela, and in Africa, notably the Congo, and the ceaseless agitation throughout southeast Asia, are typical.

The only thing peaceful about "peaceful coexistence" is the title. In any relaxed relations, it is the United States that is supposed to do the relaxing. The Communist nations continuously outrage the rights of other nations. Too long have we heard the trumpet of retreat from those who seem to favor another Munich.

If we are not going to negotiate the Vietnamese question until the aggression against South Vietnamese ceases, an equally necessary step would be to stop entertaining the overtures of the Communist nations for broader trade and diplomatic relations and to intensify our efforts to persuade our friends abroad to do the same, until the Communists have demonstrated their good faith in areas where not only freedom but life and death are at stake.

##### STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE FORD

During the past 3 years the Soviet Union and other Communist nations have, under the so-called peaceful coexistence policy, made measurable gains in trade and diplomatic concessions from the United States while offering little in return. Here are some examples:

An agreement has been initiated for the establishment of a New York-Moscow air route which the Soviet Union has long sought.

An American-Soviet treaty has been negotiated, which now awaits Senate approval, that would give the Soviets consular offices they want in New York, Chicago, and San Francisco in exchange for similar American consulates in Russia which would avail us little and only give the Communists more targets for mob violence.

Having purchased \$140 million worth of badly needed U.S. wheat on which the American taxpayer paid \$44 million in subsidies so the Soviets could buy it far below our domestic price, Russia has now bought \$11 million in soybeans which the New York Times speculated might be going to Cuba.

In response to Communist bloc overtures for expanded trade, President Johnson has named a committee to explore stepped-up sales, and the Commerce Department's issuance of export licenses for sales to Communist nations has been increasing steadily.

Even more significant, our Government last month backed down completely on its widely publicized call for the Soviet Union to pay up its assessments to the United Nations, and then compounded this loss of face by lifting a 3-month freeze on voluntary contributions to the U.N. out of the U.S. Treasury.

From a standpoint of bargaining, we constantly give much and get little or nothing in deals with the Communist nations. We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership, urge a "no concession—no deal" policy, meaning that the Communists must be ready to make concessions as the price of agreements with the United States. Until we and our allies arrive at such a policy, we can only expect more Koreans and Vietnams and an ever-widening circle of Communist subversion around the earth.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.**

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

**AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT  
ACT OF 1948, RELATING TO UNIFORM PRO-  
VISIONS FOR CROP LIENS**

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide uniform provisions for crop liens, interest on unpaid marketing quota penalties and the persons liable for such penalties for all commodities for which a marketing quota program is in effect (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

**FACILITATION OF WORK OF DEPARTMENT OF  
AGRICULTURE**

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

**REPORT ON AGREEMENTS UNDER TITLE I, AGRICULTURAL  
TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT**

A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agreements under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

**HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF  
1965**

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, urban mass transportation, and community facilities (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

**CONTINUATION OF STUDY OF EFFECTS OF  
INSECTICIDES, HERBICIDES, FUNGICIDES, AND  
OTHER PESTICIDES UPON FISH AND WILD-  
LIFE**

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 1, 1958, relating to a continuing study by the Secretary of the Interior of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses to this resource (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

**PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO FEDERAL  
POWER COMMISSION**

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Power Act to prohibit abandonment of facilities and service without the consent of the Federal Power Commission (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 202(b) of the Federal Power Act with respect to the interconnection of electric facilities (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

**REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE FEDERAL  
OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST  
FUND AND THE FEDERAL DISABILITY IN-  
SURANCE TRUST FUND**

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, managing trustees of the trust funds, and

members of the board of trustees of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and the Federal disability insurance trust fund, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

**ACT TO REMOVE TAX BARRIERS TO FOREIGN IN-  
VESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES**

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove tax barriers to foreign investment in the United States, to make certain technical amendments, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

**REPORT OF SOCIAL PROGRESS TRUST FUND**

A letter from the President, Inter-American Development Bank, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the social progress trust fund, for the calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

**WILD RIVERS ACT**

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reserve certain public lands for a national wild rivers system, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

**PAYMENT OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
CHARGES ON CERTAIN PUEBLO INDIAN  
LANDS**

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

**REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE  
UNITED STATES**

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the activities of the Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT AND CIVIL  
SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT, RELATING TO TEN-  
URE AND RETIREMENT OF REFEREES IN BANK-  
RUPTCY**

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Bankruptcy Act and the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to the tenure and retirement benefits of referees in bankruptcy (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN  
ALIENS**

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**REPEAL OF PROVISIONS OF LAW CODIFIED IN  
TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION  
39**

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the provisions of law codified in 5 U.S.C. 39, and for other

purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

**VARIATION OF WORKWEEK OF FEDERAL EMPLOY-  
EES FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES**

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit variation of the 40-hour workweek of Federal employees for educational purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

**PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS**

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

**By the VICE PRESIDENT:**

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Appropriations:

**"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1**

"Resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein), requesting the Congress of the United States favorably to consider the Bonneville unit of the central Utah project

*"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):*

"Whereas the citizens in the State of Utah have for many years looked forward to the time when water from the Colorado River could be made available to meet the essential needs of areas of this State; and

"Whereas the continued economic growth of the State requires this supply of water to meet the increased municipal, industrial, and agricultural requirements of areas within the State; and

"Whereas the State of Utah by the Colorado River compact of 1922 and the Upper Colorado River Basin compact of 1948 is entitled to portions of the waters of the Colorado River; and

"Whereas on April 11, 1956, the Congress of the United States authorized the central Utah project; and

"Whereas on March 25, 1964, the Central Utah Water Conservancy District was formed as an organization to represent the citizens to be benefited by the central Utah project and to enter into agreements with the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has studied the engineering and economics of this project, have made available a definite planned report, and submitted in the original budget to Congress of \$3,600,000 to initiate construction on the Bonneville unit of the central Utah project; and

"Whereas it is believed that all necessary documents and required prerequisites to construction will be finalized within the next few months; and

"Whereas there is a desire on the part of all the citizens of the State of Utah that the construction of this project begin during the fiscal year 1966; and

"Whereas the President's budget as submitted to the Congress of the United States did not include funds for the purpose to initiate construction on the Bonneville unit of the central Utah project: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* That the 36th session of the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor of the State of Utah concurring therein), do hereby unanimously request and pray that the 89th Congress of the United States will favorably consider this important and long awaited project to the State of Utah and thereby appropriate sufficient funds so that construction of the initial features of this project can be started during fiscal year 1966; be it further